THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

ARE the old Christian symbols outmoded ? This is but one of many questions raised in a recent book—*Christianity and Symbolism*, by Professor F. W. DILLISTONE [1]—which breaks new ground in a profound yet interesting way. Since the area covered is so vast, we confine ourselves to some points which emerge in a chapter dealing with Water Symbolism and Christian Baptism, a subject of importance in view of the fresh study of baptism to-day.

The author's conclusion is that a way forward may be found by holding in close relationship two types of interpretation. On the one hand, there is the type of interpretation which he calls analogical symbolism and associates with the name of L. S. Thornton. It views baptism as incorporation into the growing organism of the Body of Christ. It is firmly based on Scripture, for example, Gal 3^{26-29} and 1 Co 12^{4-27}, and it has the merit that it takes the element of water seriously and uses the natural powers of water as analogies of processes within the life of the spiritual organism. Moreover, it deals realistically with the time factor. If we regard Pentecost as the event in which the Church was reborn, then baptism becomes the extension of this original crisis. For the individual it has eschatological significance. It speaks of something begun which will only be completed at the Last Day. As the creative act of generation is continually being repeated on the level of the natural order, so the creative act of regeneration is continually being repeated on the level of the new order in Christ. Stress, too, is laid on the baptism of Christ as representing the baptism of all who are to be incorporated into His Body—and that applies both to His baptism of initiation at the Jordan and His baptism of suffering at Calvary, both to the baptism by water and by blood. Baptism within the Church should conform in pattern and significance to the baptism of the Redeemer.

On the other hand, there is an interpretation which Dr. DILLISTONE calls metaphorical symbolism and associates with the names of Dodd, Flemington and Cullmann. It sees in baptism the first step in the renewal of the Covenant which God made with His people in Christ. This interpretation stresses an aspect of baptism which receives too little notice in the former interpretation—baptism as marking a radical break, a renunciation, a death to sin and a new life of righteousness. This, too, is firmly grounded on Scripture, for example, Ro $6^{3ff.}$. The old Israel was separated from its past by the waters of the Red Sea and thereafter partook of God's manna in the wilderness. So in the New Testament Christ, through whose baptism by water and by blood the new Covenant was established, sealed the new Israel within the Covenant by the Last Supper. The idea of passing through the waters is essential, for it was only when the convert passed through the baptismal waters, renouncing his former life outside the Covenant and being joined to the people of God, that he partook of the bread and wine. So long as the Church is in a mission-field situation the note of renunciation or dying to live sounds clear in the baptismal service ; but that ceases when the baptism of infants is in question. In Protestantism not infrequently baptism has been taken merely as a seal of the new Covenant or as a sign of the difference between those inside and those outside the Church.

This type of interpretation has recently been brought into relation with eschatology and with the idea of the Leader, baptized by water and by blood, of whose cup each of His followers must drink ere they share His glory. His death and resurrection are the proleptic realization of the final victory : the baptism of the believer is the proleptic realization of his final deliverance from sin, and baptism thus becomes a powerful metaphorical symbol linking the baptism at Jordan with Good Friday and Easter and with the ultimate triumph of God. Unfortunately, while the symbol in history, the double event of Cross and Resurrection, does suggest renunciation and a conflict with the powers of evil issuing in sudden triumph, it must be confessed that the symbol of baptism as we know it does not. Baptism by total immersion is not likely to spread further within the churches of the Reformed tradition. Hence our author calls for a re-examination of the form of baptism, with a

[1] Collins ; 21s. net.

view to seeing whether some equivalent of the symbolic act of passing through the waters can be found.

To return to the two types of interpretation—the one stressing the relation of baptism to the natural world and the all-embracing activity of the Son of God within the world-organism, and the other stressing the relation of baptism to historical events and the eschatological acts of the Christ within the time-series—the conclusion seems clear that within the ecumenical Church room must be found for both. As Dr. DILLISTONE puts it—' It is the narrow concentration upon the interpretation of baptism as an instrumental sign of regeneration or as a legalistic seal of church-membership which hinders advance in this area of Christian symbolism. Let the Church affirm afresh the place in the rite both of the community and of the individual, both of contact with the water and of triumph over the water, both of the relation to the Divine organism and of the relation to the Divine covenant, both of incorporation and of initiation—recognizing that in differing historical circumstances emphases will differ—and baptism may yet recover its true significance within the expanding life of the Christian society.'

Doubtless many of our readers have given from the pulpit or in the Bible Class a series of addresses expository of the Lord's Prayer. Probably all would agree that they found most difficulty with the petition ' lead us not into temptation.' ' Count it all joy,' says St. James, ' when ye fall into divers temptations.' In the Bible Class or discussion circle some bright youth probably posed the question : ' If temptation be good for us, why should we pray not to be led into it ? '

Then St. James who has declared ' blessed is the man that endureth temptation ' goes on to add in the very next verse ' Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God : for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man.' Other folk as well as our bright youth are very uncertain as to what can precisely be meant by the prayer to God ' lead us not into temptation.'

What has perplexed a multitude is this—we are called to be good soldiers of Jesus Christ, we are assured that we may be conquerors and more than conquerors ; but there can be no victory if there be no battle, and in this petition we seem to be praying that for us there shall be no battle. It sounds like a petition from the cloister not from the Church militant.

In an article on ' Man's Need of God ' the Right Rev. G. F. ALLAN, M.A., Principal of Ripon College, Oxford,[1] deals with this perplexity and casts new light. His view is that the petition has been completely misunderstood. It is not, he holds, a prayer that we may not be exposed to trial or temptation, but one that we may be kept from *tempting God*. At first hearing that may strike one as novel and startling, but he adduces solid grounds for its validity. He considers our Lord's temptations in the wilderness. Of two of them—command stones to become bread, fling Thyself down from the pinnacle of the Temple—the occasion was doubt as to the reality of the revelation given to Him at His baptism. Did God really say and mean that ? Let me ask of Him physical proof of My Divine Sonship and mission. Let Me have ' signs.' He banished the temptation by recalling ' thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.' To try to put God to the test, any test of our choosing, is to tempt God. To refuse simple trust and confidence in God, and require anything like visible or tangible proof, that is to tempt the Lord our God.

The whole notion of our tempting God has largely become unfamiliar to our minds. Yet it is a thought quite familiar to Prophets and Psalmists. Principal ALLAN selects just one passage to show how tenable is his view as to the meaning of the petition. It is Ps 95^{7-11} which recalls the story of how Israel tempted God at Massah (Ex 17). The place was called Massah (temptation) not because it was where Israel were tempted, but where Israel tempted God. God had done great things for them ; but instead of trusting Him, they clamour for a new ' sign ' to prove whether God was among them or not. The condemnation followed—' I sware in my wrath, that they should not enter into my rest.' The writer to the Hebrews correctly comments ' we see that they could not enter in because of unbelief.'

' Lead us not into temptation ' means in our pilgrimage let us not come to Massah, where doubting Thy Word we require a sign.

In a most stimulating and challenging little book, *The Christian Imperative*,[2] the Rev. Dr. MAX WARREN has points well worth pondering about the preacher's task in our time. The peculiar difficulties of our day do not affect the substance of his task. It is what it has always been—to proclaim God's Word, and to win souls. The first thing the preacher must remember about his

[1] *The Modern Churchman*, September, 1955.
[2] S.C.M. : 8s. 6d. net.

hearers is that God made them. Their heredity, their environment, their education are all indeed important, but these things did not make them. God made them. 'It makes a vast difference if, as we approach our fellows, we see in them the image of God however defaced.' 'We shall start with a great hope,' for 'the primary condition of their existence is that God made them.'

The second conviction is that 'they stand in history and that God is in control of that history.' And our task is to evangelise them *where they stand*. Thirdly, the man we seek to evangelise stands in a particular relationship to God by virtue of his creation and his standing in history. Our concern is to see that the relationship is a *right* one.

The problem is how to *communicate* the gospel to them. Preaching must be futile unless speaker and hearer are on the same 'wave-length.' Not only must the hearer really receive the Word by at least understanding what the preacher says, but the preacher must understand the thoughts familiar to his hearers. He must know what they think. He must sit where they sit, be conversant with them. We have become alive to that as evidenced by such institutions as industrial chaplaincies.

To sit with men where they sit does not of course mean that the evangelist will think what they think. What a man thinks to be his greatest need may not really be that at all. Yet we must know what he thinks if we are to communicate with him at all.

The difficulty is greatly increased for us because modern man broadly speaking is not renaissance-man keenly interested in his own individuality and its worth. He is a collectivised or 'conformist' man, the 'group' not individuality is his concern. To evangelise this new group-man is a question of urgent moment for the Church everywhere—in America, Europe, and not least in Asia and Africa.

There is no easy solution. A gulf yawns between the Church and secularism. For communication it may well be as J. H. OLDHAM wrote, 'if there is to be a genuine conversation between those on opposite sides of the gulf, Christians must be willing to listen as well as to teach.'

Religious Education

Conveying the Truth of the Bible

BY THE REVEREND CHARLES SMITH, M.A., THE VICARAGE, HEATHERYCLEUGH-IN-WEARDALE

Introduction. Readers of the novels of Mary Webb will remember John Arden in *The Golden Arrow*. He was a man with a deep sense of the truth behind appearances, which enabled him to respond to his wife's constant fussing, 'Mother, that be one of the great quantity of things that dunna matter'. His background of belief in the great, calm certainties of existence showed up Patty's fuss over details for what it ultimately was—much ado about very little.

I feel that the time has almost arrived for theologians to say the same thing about the question that has so much exercised our minds for the past hundred years. That controversy may be resolved into the series of questions: Is the Bible true? Or is science true? Or is criticism true? The answer is at last beginning to emerge; and it is 'yes' to each of the questions in turn. The valuable outcome of the long debate is that it has served to clarify the truth that is in the Bible, and it has clarified it by distilling it from out of its temporal, geographical and literary contexts. Until the biological and critical sciences began their apparently destructive work, scholars had asked the wrong questions from the Bible and had looked for the wrong sort of truth. Now that the irrelevant ground has been cut from under their feet, they have been obliged to separate truth into its different aspects, and to realize that imperfections in the context in which it is presented do not necessarily invalidate the truth which is presented.

The story of the creation of man has always suggested itself as the obvious crux of the debate. Which is true: The Genesis story that man was created in the year four thousand and four B.C. or the modern pre-historian's theory that some Hominid creature, such as Heidelberg Man or Australo-Pithecus existed something like a quarter or half a million years ago? When we can answer, 'Both are true', and have no mental reservations about either affirmation, then we have thoroughly assimilated the fruits of the long controversy between Biblical scholarship and scientific discovery. Briefly, for the moment, the Bible declares the truth that God is responsible for the process; and it sets that truth in a context of the state of material knowledge existing at the time.

The pre-historian has discovered the means by which the creative process took shape, and he sets out his description of that means or machinery in the context of the knowledge existing to-day. The two truths are complementary to one another; only when we know them both are we in possession of the complete truth, for it has two aspects.

1. *The Nature of Truth.* No man can ever see all the faces of truth in one moment of apprehension: for truth cannot be perceived, as it were, neat. To be apprehended at all it must be seen in a context—which is the equivalent of the water carrying a healing sediment; and it must be seen in relation to a particular significance. To perceive truth in its wholeness we must first divide it into its various contexts and significances, and then reassemble the parts we have thus discovered. Take a rainbow as an obvious instance. Poetically it is a thing of beauty: scientifically it is a spectrum: mythologically it is the path to a pot of gold: Biblically it is the visible symbol of a covenant with God. Which is true? Aesthetically it is beautiful: scientifically it is a mere splitting up of light by the prismatic effect of particles of water: in a fairy tale how could one better express the impossibility of arriving at either end of the bow than by holding out the impossible promise of a pot of gold if one succeeded? And religiously how could one better express the awe produced in the mind of a primitive, natural man by the spreading wonder in the heavens, than by saying that surely God put it there? In each instance the truth has been put into a context with a significance for our imagination or our reason to bite on. Otherwise we could never have seen it at all. A man who can see only one of the four aspects is seeing only a quarter of the truth, for the truth contains all four. It just depends how we look for it.

Now, it is most important to notice that scientific truth—number two in the list of rainbow truths—is as much a partial abstraction from full truth as any of the others. That is the thing we so badly overlook nowadays. And equally we must remember that 1955 scientific truth will no longer be true in the same way in 1965, for it is constantly undergoing changes and adjustments. The debates between astronomers and anthropologists which are going on all the time are evidence enough of that. Once any truth has been superseded by a fuller truth, even a scientific truth, the original perception is to be described as a myth. Now that doesn't make the original truth contained in the so-called myth untrue: it merely asks for the effort of knowledge and imagination to re-create the climate of opinion in which the first statement of truth was apprehended: by this means we should be able to make our own, and reinterpret in terms of our own age, the truth that the so-called myth enshrined. This has been the very great contribution to Biblical scholarship made by the debates of the last hundred years. It has enabled us to set each Biblical truth in its proper historical context. Once we can see the context in which a truth was given and the significance which called it forth, we are well on the way to extracting the precious kernel of truth from whatever in its husk is temporary or unsound. It is surely time now for fundamentalists and critics to be enfolded together in one synthesis which includes them both.

2. *The Truth of the Bible.* Biblical truth is truth for salvation: it is that one face of truth, selected from many others, which is alone necessary to set the soul of man upon the path which leads to God. Only two conditions are essential if this aim is to be fulfilled: firstly, the Bible must reveal a body of knowledge about the God who is the goal of man's spiritual pilgrimage; and, secondly, it must reveal the way of life by which man may most successfully attain that objective. The Bible is a true book in so far as it achieves this twofold purpose satisfactorily. And let us remind ourselves that the various husks in which the truth is contained, and about which there has been so much, and so acrimonious, discussion are in the last resort among the 'great quantity of things that dunna matter.' Important though it be to see them and analyse them for what they really are, *i.e.*, husks or wrappings of the truth.

Perhaps the best approach to a discovery of the truth of the Bible is to see it as a book divided into two parts, hinging upon one central Figure: that Figure, of course, is the Person of Jesus Christ. If we believe that in Him we see a glory like the glory of the Father, full of grace and truth, then we can look back upon the Old Testament as a gradual leading up to that great central fact, and we can look upon the remainder of the New Testament as a reflection upon it. Then, I think we will find that both Old and New Testaments fall naturally into place, and that the Person of Christ supplies the criteria by which the truth of them is to be assessed.

By way of illustration I shall use only one of the greater themes of the Bible—Creation. The same principles of judgment will apply to any of the other details of the revelation.

Creation. The Genesis story, if we analyse it, can be seen to include the two causes of the creating of the universe. 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth'. That is a statement of the ultimate causality, the First Cause, beyond which reason cannot probe, because

there is no 'beyond'. The most we can do by way of further search is to inquire why God should have chosen to externalize this part of Himself which we call the material universe. The answer has been given with fair unanimity by theologians throughout the ages: God created out of the superabundance of His love, in order that He might love, and in return be loved by, His creatures. And, at the other extreme, it is a statement of the Final Cause. 'In His own image and likeness made He him'. In other words, to adapt an old formula, God made men—that is the First Cause—in order that men might become as gods—that is the Final Cause. That is the truth enshrined in the Bible account of creation: and how much better it is said than in the cumbersome analytical language with which I have had to expound it. From the first chapter of Genesis to the opening words of the Gospel according to St. Mark the Bible is an account of the gradual fulfilment of this Divine purpose. The inspired probings of the Old Testament prophets are a quest for the God whom man is destined to resemble and love—for how can one love a being of whom one knows or sees nothing?—and for the way of life which will best equip man for that response. It is only when we have seen the Person of Christ, in Himself the perfect consummation of a Divine man and a way of life absolutely consistent with that ideal, that we can see the drift of the Genesis story with clarity. The great scheme of creation was unfolded by God for this: that it might produce Christ-like creatures, capable of transmuting this world of space and time into the semblance of eternity.

If we set against that the various assortment of scientific theories necessary to build up a picture of the created world, we shall find a totally different aspect of truth. The astronomers will describe the ordered working of the universes, the physicists will describe the constitution of matter, the palæontologists will set before us the ancient procession of fossils, the geologists will analyse the strata of the earth's crust and so forth. They will each take to pieces the machinery by which the creation has worked and is working, and attempt to put it together again so that we may examine it as it were through a glass panel. The work is valuable and true; but it never arrives at a First Cause and it does not aim at a Final Cause. They both belong to a face of truth which the scientist does not aspire to delineate—if, indeed, he admits the existence of such imponderable realities.

Even this short and simple analysis is enough to show that one set of facts is susceptible of two totally different interpretations. The Bible interprets in terms of causes and values; the scientist and the critic interpret in terms of machinery and sequence. The fundamentalist scholar goes astray in that he extends his perfectly accurate interpretation of causes and values so that it covers the machinery and sequences of events as well: the materialistic scientist goes astray because he extends his equally accurate interpretation of the machinery by which the universe operates to include also the reason for its origin or the objective towards which it is directed. For a complete view of truth in the round we must set both interpretations side by side; the two of them together are more than twice as true as either of them singly, because they, as it were, react upon and fill out each other.

Those are a few reflections drawn from one facet of the Biblical revelation. An examination of any other of the great themes of redemption—the nature and destiny of man, sin, man in society—would produce the same conclusions.

One of the great features of our time is a return to Biblical Theology. If that return is made so that it includes and transcends the bitter and often disrupting controversies of the past hundred years, then there seems to be no limit to the advance of Biblical scholarship and the acceptance of Biblical standards: but if the proclamation is merely made that 'the Bible is true,' without inquiring in what way it is true, then another generation of strife is having the way made plain for it. A hundred years ago the Bible was ousted from its place at the centre of our national life because men sought a wrong aspect of truth from it; the best way to put it back again is to seek the right sort—truth for salvation—and to recognize that any other questions belong ultimately to 'the great quantity of things that dunna matter'.

Literature

EARLY VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

EVERY student knows that his text-books on Textual Criticism supply far more information about the Greek manuscripts than they give concerning the early versions, apart, perhaps, from the Latin Versions. A big step forward in remedying this defect is provided by the *magnum opus* of Professor Arthur Vööbus—*Early Versions of the New Testament* (Stockholm; $12+porto). Professor Vööbus is Professor at the Chicago Lutheran

Theological Seminary, but was formerly Associate Professor of Historical Theology at the University of Tartu, and at the Baltic University in Hamburg-Pinneberg.

There is much pathos in the dedication page in the inscription, 'Dedicated to the Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary in Gratitude and Esteem,' and especially in the quotation in Greek, 'I was a stranger and you welcomed me.' In the Preface Dr. Vööbus says, 'In my refugee's bag I have carried this present work. In that moment when I could give one last look at my study and had to make the difficult decision of putting what I could in my bag and seeing what I had to leave, there was no question about this work. It had taken too much of my life and work.' He bears warm testimony to the officials of the great manuscript collections throughout Europe for their courtesy during the twenty years he spent on a quest for manuscripts, collating codices, examining fragments, and accumulating 'debris of the centuries.' 'I tried to forget from the beginning,' he writes, 'what has been said and assumed and simply tried to listen to the sources with an unprejudiced mind, having no preconceived plan.' The result is this scholarly work of three hundred and nine pages, to which are added fifty-four pages recording the manuscripts and sources quoted, the relevant literature, and the indexes, together with twenty-four invaluable plates of manuscripts with annotations.

The versions discussed include Tatian's Diatessaron, the Latin, Syriac, Armenian, Georgian, Coptic, Ethiopic, Arabic, and Gothic Versions, and in each case, apart from a treatment of special problems, the extant material, questions of origin, the character of the text, and its rôle in textual history are patiently examined.

It is not possible in a review to give a detailed account of the conclusions reached by Professor Vööbus. For this a considerable article would be necessary. In general it may be said that he is impressed by the wide influence of the Old Syriac on other versions. He has illuminated many old problems and raised many new ones and it will be some time before the value of his results and suggestions can be assessed. He speaks with justice of a period of stagnation, extending to our own day, regarding the study of the versions. 'Handbooks,' he says, 'on the textual criticism of the New Testament have been reprinted, because there has been almost nothing to add to the picture given long ago.' The versions, he maintains, have often been abused for textual theories. 'And what pitfalls such a situation can cause,' he adds, 'can be seen particularly in connexion with the studies around the "Cæsarean" text.' There is no doubt that the 'period of stagnation' will be followed by a new interest as the result of what Professor Vööbus has written, and it is to be hoped that the very small band of experts will be increased by those who feel it to be of first importance to determine what the sacred writers wrote. One cannot be too grateful for this illuminating and stimulating work.

VINCENT TAYLOR

BUDDHISM

The mystery of 'silence' as associated with Buddhism is the central theme of this carefully written and well-documented book on the Mādhyamika system (*c.* A.D. 180)—*The Central Philosophy of Buddhism*, by Professor T. R. V. Murti, M.A., D.Litt. (Allen and Unwin ; 30s. net)—which the author takes to be a setting forth of the main teaching of Buddhism. Of the two great divisions of Buddhism—the Hīnayāna and the Mahāyāna—the latter, according to him, is to be taken as typical.

We are so often told that Buddha kept 'silence' when questioned that we are constrained to ask what this silence meant. Was it mere practicality —a recommendation that when a man is wounded by an arrow, he should not before treatment waste time in asking what kind of an arrow struck him ? Or, was it agnostic despair of finding any truth, or, on the other hand, a nihilistic assertion that the goal was utter emptiness ? None of these—according to Dr. Murti. Nirvāna is not nothingness, the void is *devoid* of theories, but not itself emptiness : it reaches to the real Absolute.

Like Mrs. Rhys Davids in her more recent work, he arrives at a positive conclusion, but he is utterly opposed to her method of interpretation. She has argued that the negative aspect of Buddhism is a later scholastic accretion and that Buddha himself had asserted the existence of soul and had really accepted the ideal of the Upanishads that the Self is an ultimate value. Dr. Murti denies this and alleges that Buddhism in its central teaching adhered neither to the doctrine of the Ātman, or universal soul, or to its opposite. The Mādhyamika system relied upon dialectic—the putting over against each other of speculative theories in order that their contradictions might be exhibited and they might ultimately be discarded—a procedure in many ways similar to that of Kant, except that, in our author's view, the latter is not sufficiently thorough and regards the moral as an ultimate value instead of a preparatory discipline. Dr. Murti argues that his own view implies no depreciation of the moral, which is actually in accordance with his method and comparable—if we illustrate him rightly—to the discovery by restorationists of valuable carvings and pictures under a layer of plaster. Nirvāna is not to be attained by good

works, but good works help towards the realization of freedom, and in that realization there is the recognition that in every man there is a spark of the Divine.

Consequently, Buddha is not merely one historical character (such a conception was the error of the Hīnayāna Buddhists) but the Buddhas are innumerable and emerge whenever the Buddhist seeker gets beyond engrossment with his own salvation and is equally concerned with the salvation of all.

Yet man cannot reach the ideal by his own power, but only by becoming one with God, who is not merely the Absolute, but has within Him the element of compassion whereby He enters mediatorially into the phenomenal world and reveals His fundamental equality with all beings, inspiring them to a corresponding attitude towards their fellows.

Dr. Murti's distinctions between his own views and other interpretations of Buddhism are extremely subtle, but they repay study and carry a considerable amount of conviction; they leave us with the impression that Christianity as well as Buddhism has meant a great deal to him.

W. S. URQUHART

THE CHRISTIAN USE OF THE PSALMS

This book—*The Christian Use of the Psalms*—by Dr. Henry De Candole, the Bishop of Knaresborough (Mowbray; 6s. net), has the merit that it has been constructed to meet a specific need of a specific group of people; the need is real, and the people are important. The Anglican Church since the Reformation has given a special place in its public worship to the Psalms. There are signs that new ways are endangering this central emphasis. And with the decline in the use of the Psalms there has gone a declining knowledge of the Old Testament in general. This little book is one more sign that those in authority in that Church are aware of this danger, and are determined to meet it.

The book aims at helping to recover a point of view which will once more make the Psalms essential to Christian worship, both in the Eucharist and in the Offices. It is not concerned with the interpretation of individual Psalms. After a brief general survey, we are reminded (and here use is made of Dr. C. H. Dodd's book 'According to the Scriptures') how wide is the use that the New Testament makes of the Psalms, and after it the Church in its worship, including Isaac Watts with his declared intention of 'teaching David to speak like a Christian'! Then comes the heart of the book, a valuable chapter on the interpretation of the Psalms. Our author shows how the New Testament way of interpreting applies to the Church of all times. For the experience of the 'wonderful works of God,' which in one form or another is the basis of the Psalms, is relived by the new Israel, 'in whom history has reached its fulfilment.'

How is this fresh sense that the Psalms are necessary for Christian worship to come to the Church in our day? Historical and form criticism can never be more than a preparation. The way of allegory which held the field for so long needs bit and bridle to control it lest it turn and devour us. Here we are shown with clarity and pastoral affection what the other way is, the way that the Lord Himself used. This permits and welcomes every new light that scholarship can throw on the Scriptures. And yet it can be used by every sincere worshipper, who has no head for such things, to his comfort and profit. The Christian use of the Psalms is that true higher criticism which a Christian instinctively wields when he becomes a disciple; and it is all the better for the firm guidance that a book like this gives.

HERBERT W. NEWELL

HARLEY STREET AND HEALING

Dr. Christopher Woodard has followed *A Doctor Heals by Faith*, first published in 1953 and now in its fifth impression, with *A Doctor's Faith Holds Fast* (Max Parrish; 12s. 6d. net each). Dr. Woodard became a doctor of medicine because he felt he had a vocation to it, and he has specialized in the treatment of soft-tissue injuries in sport.

The earlier of these books begins with an account of the author's upbringing in a country rectory, and goes on to tell of the remarkable healing of Dr. Woodard's son Christopher when gravely ill with meningitis at the age of two and a half. The outlook was of the blackest, but in addition to availing himself of all the help that modern medicine and surgery could give Dr. Woodard asked for the prayers of many friends and did not hesitate to pray himself beside the child. He writes: 'I honestly believe that a very important factor in this case was my holding his hands for a prolonged period that first evening, because some form of energy passed from my healthy body into his weak body, which I am sure helped to fight this terrible affliction.'

Of the other cases described some are examples of how much can be accomplished when the prayer of faith is added to the skill of the doctor, or when the patient is surrounded by an atmosphere of love; but in other cases, such as that of the child of twelve with infantile paralysis, or the woman of forty-two with cancer, Dr. Woodard added to prayer the laying-on of hands, with remarkable results.

He has some valuable things to say about barriers that come between the patient and God, and expresses the view that all delayed healing is caused by human unbelief.

The second book, published this May, is much less satisfying. The account of the healing of the possessed girl is astonishing but well attested, but one wonders why the case of Gavin—who died after the most strenuous efforts of parents and doctors, combined with prayer and the laying-on of hands—should be cited as a 'success,' even although one agrees with Dr. Woodard that physical healing is not to be made the criterion. It is not as if the child had attained a supernatural peace before dying, and though Dr. Woodard accepts his death as part of the Divine plan, the reader, outwith the situation, is unconvinced. Elsewhere—as he admits—Dr. Woodard has said that he does not believe that a child is ever meant to die. Why not hold to this belief, and see Gavin's death as due to some failure in human co-operation with God ?

The truth is that Dr. Woodard, like all others engaged in 'Faith Healing,' has come up against insoluble problems. That is not his fault, but one feels that he has tried to answer some of them too soon.

But when all adverse criticisms are made, this book, like its fellow, is a welcome challenge to faith. Many doctors and some ministers will resent its candid comments, but others will be thankful that among the medical specialists of to-day there are men like Dr. Woodard with a faith they are ready to live by, a faith that is not kept in a compartment of the mind that is discreetly concealed from the gaze of the patient, but brought out into the open and recognized as a curative factor of first importance.

Dr. Woodard's whole approach to medicine, his emphasis upon the value of co-operation between doctors and clergy, and his acute awareness of the world of the spirit—all these things make these books books to be read by ministers, doctors, and laymen, for they have much to teach us all, provided that we read in a humble spirit.

One hopes that Dr. Woodard will write a third book on healing, but that he will think through many of the problems more fully before he again commits his thoughts to print.

HAMISH MCINTOSH

AFRICAN MISSIONS

In the third volume of his fascinating survey—*The Planting of Christianity in Africa* (Lutterworth Press ; 25s. net)—Professor C. P. Groves deals with the years 1878–1914, the vital period of European penetration into Africa.

The partition and colonization of Africa by the powers of Europe meant for missions at once an enlarged opportunity and a restricted sphere. The opportunity came in the extension of law and order, the development of communications, the open path for commerce along with Christianity. But with the closer grip of European control the missionary stood in African eyes as a member of the ruling race. The Zulu King Chaka was assured by an African from Natal that 'a white man, assuming the character of a teacher or missionary, would arrive among them, and obtain permission to build a house ; that shortly after, he would be joined by one or two more white men ; and in course of time, an army would enter his country which would subvert his government, and, eventually, the white people would rule in his stead.' Which, in a way, is what happened. In this study, indeed, all the tensions and problems of Africa to-day are foreshadowed.

The year 1910 stands as a landmark of hope not only for the Christian mission in Africa, but for the world. There was a steady drawing together in counsel and understanding, a drawing together across both denominational and national barriers, that held bright promise for the future. 'But the brightness of the day of promise was soon to be overcast as the rumbling clouds of war, fast gathering over Europe, swept across the African sky. And when at last the sky had cleared again, the nineteenth-century world had gone for ever.'

D. M. MCFARLAN

TEXTUAL CRITICISM

Volume xvi. in 'Studies and Documents,' edited by Silva Lake and Carsten Høeg, has now been published under the title, *Annotated Bibliography of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, 1914–1939* (E. Munksgaard, Copenhagen ; kr. 24). The volume has been compiled by Professor Bruce M. Metzger, and an interesting Foreword is supplied by Professor E. C. Colwell, who says that it is part of the foundation for the great task of textual critics in the rewriting of the history of the text and the recreation of theory. A list of books, monographs, studies, dissertations, and articles may not seem to promise an attractive fare, but Professor Metzger has the gift not only of supplying valuable technical information but also of making scholarly and interesting comments. Separate chapters treat Handbooks of Textual Criticism, Greek Manuscripts, the Versions, the Church Fathers, Tatian's Diatessaron and Mediæval Harmonies of the Gospels, Families of Texts, the Textual Criticism of Specific Passages, Palæography, and Personalia. Valuable quotations are given from works not readily available to the ordinary student. For example, the views of

T. Ayuso are summarized, in which a distinction is drawn between the pre-Cæsarean type of text found in P^{45}, W, fam. 1, 28, and fam. 13, and the Cæsarean text proper attested by Θ 565, 700, Origen, Eusebius, the Sinaitic Syriac, the Old Georgian, and the Old Armenian Versions.

VINCENT TAYLOR

BURIED WORLDS

This little book—*Discovering Buried Worlds*, by Professor André Parrot (S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net)—deserves more than a brief notice. It introduces a new series from the S.C.M. Press, called 'Studies in Biblical Archaeology', which will include such titles as 'The Flood and Noah's Ark', 'The Tower of Babel', 'Nineveh and the Old Testament', 'St. Paul's Journeys in the Greek Orient', 'The Temple of Jerusalem', 'Golgotha and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre'; others are promised dealing with Mari and the Old Testament, the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ur of the Chaldees, the Exodus, and the Lachish Letters in their relation to Jeremiah. All these monographs should provide valuable background material for understanding the Bible—both Old and New Testaments. Another factor which makes the series important is that the S.C.M. has been fortunate, and wise, to obtain as author of most of the series Professor André Parrot, Chief Curator of the French National Museums, Professor at the Louvre, and Director of the well-known Mari Archaeological Expedition. His name is known to readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES as that of a careful archaeologist, accurate scholar, and yet an excellent and simple writer whose aim is to relate his archaeological discoveries to the Bible so that the gospel proclaimed by Jesus may be more fully understood and accepted.

For the working minister, as well as for the student who wishes to assess the importance of archaeological discoveries and to use the light thrown by them on the Word of God, written and made flesh, this introductory monograph cannot be ignored. The author has succeeded amazingly well in so short a space in orientating the reader in archaeological periods, and the names commonly used for them, in the chronology of the Bible lands of the Near East, the history of the excavations, and 'the saga of the archaeologists' from 1842 to 1952. In the final chapter—Biblical Past and Oriental Background—he sums up the value of archaeology for Biblical studies and what archaeology has to tell the Bible reader: the confirmation of historical facts, the making of Revelation more tangible, the restoring to us of the soul of those vanished people through whom God spoke in different languages but with the same accent, and the witness to the existence from the beginning of a two-fold current of traffic between earth and heaven. If the remainder of the series is up to this standard it will be necessary to order our copy of each monograph early. The book is well printed and produced and the thirty illustrations are excellent.

J. N. SCHOFIELD

Seeking asylum from Hitler's Germany Dr. Heinrich W. Cassirer was received as a Research Student by Glasgow University, in which for some time now he has been a Lecturer in the Department of Philosophy. He has published a noteworthy book—*Kant's First Critique* (Allen and Unwin; 30s. net). When he first appeared in Glasgow he had little mastery of the English language. The book shows that his linguistic progress has been remarkable. No sentence reads like translated German. The phrasing throughout is felicitous, and no one would guess that a foreigner had composed it. The value of the book is *a priori* attested by the fact that it appears as an item in the Muirhead Library of Philosophy and *a posteriori* from a perusal of it.

Dr. Cassirer was nurtured philosophically on Kantianism. A special value attaches to an estimate of a system by an insider. Yet he is no blind devotee of the master. There are several important points on which he holds that Kant's views are largely valueless; for example, the discussion of Space and Time, or the metaphysical deduction of the Categories, or 'things-in-themselves.' At the same time he holds in his Preface that 'the errors of the great philosophers are generally speaking not only more interesting but more fruitful than the truths propounded by lesser men.'

Where he differs from Kant he gives his own reasons for differing, and suggests a more tenable view. He does not expect, as Kant seemed to do, that every sensible person will agree with him. To the deep problems of philosophy no final answer has been yet found, and never may be.

All students of philosophy, especially of Kant, will find here much light and stimulation. The book is not a running commentary on Kant. Certain important points in the *First Critique* are selected for discussion. Why they are selected and treated as they are is explained in the Preface, which *must* be read if Dr. Cassirer's book is to be understood alike as to its origination and its aim.

This translation, the first in English, of a book published by Kierkegaard in 1847—*Gospel of Sufferings*, translated from the Danish by A. S. Aldworth and W. S. Ferrie (James Clarke; 10s. 6d. net)—is described by the translators as intended 'to disclose the meaning of the most

meaningless element in life.' It is written obviously out of Kierkegaard's own experience, which was not exactly happy in the ordinary sense of the term. In these chapters he shows forth in poignant and penetrating language the joy which is to be found in the following of Christ even through the suffering which is essential to a genuine faith. His confidence is that when the need is greatest, the help is nearest, and that the fretfulness of those who bear the light burden heavily may be transformed into the courageous and joyous meekness of those who bear the heavy burden lightly. The meaning of suffering is discovered in finding the restfulness of obedience, and the finding of rest is our fitting for eternity. The sombre character of Kierkegaard's teaching as a whole is perhaps shadowed forth in his tortuous but powerful argument that it is only when in suffering we feel that we are guilty before God that we can be fully confident of the love of God.

A study of the Christian doctrine of vocation has come to hand in the form of six lectures under the title *Completing the Reformation*, by Professor William Robinson, formerly of Selly Oak, Birmingham, and now of Butler University, Indianapolis, They are published at $1.00 by the College of the Bible Press, Lexington, Kentucky.

Luther and Calvin saw clearly that the Christian layman has a religious vocation as truly as any priest or monk ; but this part of our Reformation tradition has been all too frequently forgotten. To stress it again would be the logical completion of the Reformation. Hopeful signs in that direction are not wanting, for instance the Kirchentag Movement in Germany and the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey. Dr. Robinson's lectures, particularly those on the Clergy and Laity in the New Testament and on the Church as the Household of God, are an earnest plea for the ministry of the laity.

Perhaps the Rev. Hugh Ross Williamson's nonconformist upbringing suggested to him the desirability of expounding *The Great Prayer* (Collins ; 12s. 6d. net), which now commends itself to his Anglo-Catholic sympathies as a basis of reunion. However this may be, he has given us an interesting and enlightening volume, though it is unfortunate that exact references to the source of citations should not be given and that the only clue to the origin of a number of quotations is the inverted commas by which they are marked. There are wise comments on such topics of current interest as the bearing of the truth of the Incarnation on belief in the ubiquity of Christ, the principles of sacrifice set forth in Eucharistic worship, or the old British heresy of Pelagianism, ' which might even be called modern British orthodoxy.' The writer's background, however, and perhaps his experience as a ' worker-priest,' should have prevented his believing that what was accepted when St. Augustine came to England in 597 can easily be restored to general favour after long centuries of change. We may know something of ' the countless gradations of life-forms descending from men to the protoplasm ' without easily accepting the belief, commended here, that ' our exalted brethren, the angels,' bridge the opposite gulf between man and deity. Nor is it possible to roll back the course of history and its controversies as if the mere antiquity of The Great Prayer were ground for declaring that it contains nothing with which all Christians will not agree. To suggest, for example, that the assertion ' the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England ' is ' a plain statement of fact which is equally applicable to any foreign ruler ' will not secure widespread unanimity. To say that ' it is impossible to love Christ without loving Mary ' is likely to arouse controversy rather than agreement, as is the contention that we should speak not only of the Church Triumphant and of the Church Militant, but also of the Church Expectant, in Purgatory.

We commend for adult discussion groups as well as for the private reader *Man and His Needs*, by the Rev. John Lawson (Edinburgh House Press ; 5s. net). The sub-title is ' A Study in the Hope for Civilization.' In five chapters, entitled 'What is Man ? ', ' Food ', ' Freedom ', ' Fellowship ' and ' Forgiveness ', Mr. Lawson, with constant reference to Scripture, offers constructive Christian comments on modern world problems—malnutrition, the colour bar, etc. Each chapter has a dozen or more questions for group discussion. We trust this book will be widely used.

Words and Wisdom : A Selection from the Writings of Henry Bett (Epworth Press ; 8s. 6d. net) consists of a selection from the articles which Dr. Bett published in ' The Methodist Recorder ' over a long series of years. Dr. Bett has read widely in folk-lore and word-lore. This is a fascinating book in which all kinds of queer and interesting facts emerge about all kinds of people and places and dates. It is entrancing to read the history of St. Swithun and to discover that there is a tie-up across the ages between Guy Fawkes and the Vestal Virgins in Rome. The man who reads this book will acquire in an hour or two a vast assortment of miscellaneous knowledge which it would take him a life-time to acquire by himself. These articles well deserved reprinting, and, if there are any more like them, they do not deserve to be left buried in the files of ' The Methodist Recorder '.

If another book of such articles can be put together, by all means let us have it. Such pleasant erudition is all too scarce.

In *What is a Missionary?*, by Mr. Douglas Webster (Highway Press; 2s. net), the writer's points of view are very varied and give freshness to his treatment, but the conclusions in the book are very similar to those which are canvassed at multitudinous missionary conferences at the present day. He lays valuable emphasis upon certain necessary considerations. His reference to the danger of excessive concentration on evangelism as if it were something by itself is to be welcomed, and his remark that 'much of the most effective evangelism is done as men stand on the Christian frontier in some secular occupation, witnessing for Christ there' is a pertinent challenge to the frequent depreciation of educational and other institutional work directed towards social welfare. His chapter on 'Vocation' is especially useful, with its recognition that often decision is reached in answer to the question, 'What is to prevent me from going?' A helpful suggestion and one sounding theological depths is the linking of the missionary calling with the doctrine of the Trinity. The touching reference at the end of the book to J. R. Mott is a graceful tribute to one who was so outstanding a pioneer in the Student Volunteer Movement.

Professor H. H. Rowley has turned once again to the problem of the ministries of Nehemiah and Ezra, that most intricate and continuously recurrent problem of Old Testament scholars. Previously, he started with the work of Ezra; now he approaches the problem from the other end—*Nehemiah's Mission and Its Background* (Manchester University Press; 3s. 6d. net). This monograph is a reprint from the March 1955 'Bulletin of the John Rylands Library'. Did Ezra come first to Jerusalem? Or was it Nehemiah? If Ezra was as successful as Ezr 10 suggests, why did Nehemiah apparently have to begin all over again in Neh 13? The importance of the problem is connected with the fact that we are here dealing with the foundation of Judaism. Who was it that put into effective practice the Habdalah (Separation) principles of post-exilic Judaism? Dr. Rowley claims only probability, but his solution is that Nehemiah came first, managed to get the walls of the city built, but failed in his separation policy. This policy was carried into effect by Ezra some forty-seven years after Nehemiah first became governor. This solution, adopted by many British scholars, is a development of a suggestion first put forward by Vernes in 1889, and worked out by van Hoonacker in 1890.

We have come to look forward with eager expectation to the volumes in the 'Gateway Handbooks of Religious Knowledge' series. The latest volume, *Philosophy and Religion*, by Mr. George Whitfield, M.A. (Religious Education Press; 6s. 6d. net), is at least as valuable as its predecessors. Dr. Yeaxlee in the Introduction to the series reminds us that a gateway suggests an entry rather than a final attainment. 'These books are intended to open up the subjects with which they deal.' The sub-title of the present volume is 'An Introduction to Some Questions of Belief.' The great value of this book is that it does not so much tell young people *what* to think as *how* to think. It has a chapter on the Apostles' Creed entitled, 'What Do Christians Believe?' which is a masterpiece of compressed and suggestive illumination. The chapter on 'The Interpretation of History' is specially valuable. H. A. L. Fisher could say: 'Men wiser and more learned than I have discerned in history a plot, a rhythm, a predetermined pattern. These harmonies are concealed from me. I can only see one emergency following upon another as wave upon wave.' Henry Ford remarked succinctly: 'History is bunk.' Marx saw in history the Hegelian dialectical tension which can only be resolved by the violent clash which will produce the classless society in which the tension will at last be eliminated. In history the Bible sees God. 'History is an interplay between the personalities of men and the Personality of God.' This interplay has three effects. (1) It issues in the punishment of the evil and the encouragement of the good. (2) It issues in the belief that God can use even evil nations and evil men in the carrying out of His will. Cyrus is God's 'shepherd' and God's 'anointed,' as it were, in spite of himself. (3) Events are teleological. The significance of any event can only be understood by looking at the future as well as the past. 'Anyone would have a very limited idea of a bird's egg who thought of it only in terms of the past as the product of the bird.' Things must be looked at in terms of purpose, and then disaster often becomes opportunity. In view of all that the Biblical view is that 'the course of history expresses the purpose of God.'

Any teacher who is honestly trying to help senior scholars to think will find this book invaluable; and any preacher will find in it any number of impulses to fresh thought and fresh presentation of the truth.

Bible Study Exercises, by Mr. C. M. Jones (S.C.M.; 4s. net), is a book which will be very helpful to teachers. It starts from the common criticism that many students in college and university have read many books *about* the Bible, but

have not read the Bible itself. This book supplies Bible exercises based on suggested Bible Readings, the solutions to which are to be found by further Bible study. The result is that this little book is nothing less than a training in Biblical research. There are two brief but helpful introductory chapters, one on the Bible and one on Bible research; and then there follow fifty-six Bible exercises based on this method of research. The exercises begin with the Creation story and go right up to the Church and to the New Testament Letters. There are eleven very brief but very excellent Additional Notes on such subjects as the use of the word 'myth,' the Septuagint, the structure of the Book of Isaiah, The Lost Ending of Mark. This is Bible study at its best. We hope that this book will be widely used, not only in schools and colleges, but also in study groups in churches up and down the country.

Blinded Eagle, by the Rev. H. C. Whitley (S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net), is an introduction to the Life and Teaching of Edward Irving. This is a wholly fascinating book, written by one who is both a master of and in love with his subject. We see Irving the teacher. We see Irving undergoing trials for licence in Kirkcaldy. In those days trials for licence took six months and consisted of five different preachments: 'one an exegesis in Latin, another an exercise in Greek New Testament criticism, a third a homily, a fourth addressed to the clergy to show gifts of expounding Scripture, a fifth addressed to the people to show gifts of dividing the word.' Irving began in Kirkcaldy and even there he had 'ower muckle grandeur' to please some. Irving was never a man who could be satisfied 'with the certified soundness of dull men.' We see Irving as assistant to Dr. Chalmers. We see him move to the Caledonian Church in London which at his coming had a congregation of only fifty people. We read the story of how Irving electrified London, and of how his Christology and the phenomenon of speaking with tongues lead straight to trouble. In Irving's trouble Chalmers offered no help; 'he guarded his safety and his silence.' Finally we see Irving impeached by the Presbytery of Annan and cast out into the wilderness. Irving had tremendous qualities. He had a faculty for 'making truth hurt.' He had a great doctrine of the Church. 'He saw it always as the organ of communication between the invisible Christ and the visible world.' He was one of the first men to face the problem of communication. In one of his prefaces he writes: 'It hath appeared to the author of this book that the chief obstacle to the progress of divine truth over the minds of men is the want of its being sufficiently presented to them.'

There is one flaw in Dr. Whitley's book. Time and time again he goes out of his way to denigrate Dr. Chalmers and to imply and sometimes to say that Dr. Chalmers, through the Disruption, destroyed the effectiveness of the Church of Scotland. It is a pity that Dr. Whitley for once allowed prejudice to cloud judgment. Had there been no Disruption, and had the system of patronage still obtained, it is quite certain that a man with Dr. Whitley's virile, challenging, disturbing preaching would never have occupied the pulpit of St. Giles, Edinburgh!

Green and Pleasant Land, by the Rev. John Lawson (S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net), is a study of life and religion in the rural districts of England. Mr. Lawson, who is himself a Methodist minister, writes with particular attention to the many country villages where the Church of England and the Methodist Church share the allegiance of the religious community; but his analysis of the situation and his suggested remedies have a relevance beyond these churches and beyond England. Mr. Lawson does not pretend to know all the answers, but he knows some of them, and he writes in a pleasant and well-informed fashion. We particularly commend his chapter on rural youth work.

Mr. Francis Jones has put an enormous amount of work into his book, *The Holy Wells of Wales* (University of Wales Press; 12s. 6d. net), and supplements his main argument by an extensive bibliography, copious annotations, and elaborate statistical tables. He takes his researches very seriously, disdaining the suggestion that the well-cult is merely 'interesting' as a fading relic of superstition and claiming that it is a living and illuminating form of one of the most primitive religions, with amazing powers of persistence. He attempts no continuous narrative, but discusses informatively the development of the cult through the ages, as shown by the material which he has amassed, commenting on the relation of pre-Christian practices to the effort of Catholicism to incorporate them and the effect of the iconoclastic attitude of the reformers—which attitude he seems on the whole rather to resent. Very cleverly he shows how in modern times what used to be called superstition has been made respectable through scientific and medical analysis of the healing properties of water, and has also had its dignity enhanced by being re-named 'folklore' and subjected to the painstaking investigations of world-famous archaeologists. The book will be an invaluable source-book for the study of this aspect of comparative religion. The value would have been increased if the author had extended his comparisons to Eastern as well as to Celtic lands

Important Hypotheses Reconsidered

III. The Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles

By the Reverend P. N. Harrison, M.A., D.Litt., D.D., Bournemouth

It seems only natural that in the course of thirty-four years the writer of a book like *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* should have been led by the comments of other scholars, and by his own further studies, to reconsider opinions published so long ago. I have to thank the editors of The Expository Times for their invitation to record in these pages a summary of my present position.

In all its main features I believe the hypothesis advocated in that book to be the true solution of this problem. I still hold that in their present form these Epistles cannot possibly have been written by St. Paul, but are, like so many other ancient writings, including some of the most precious and most truly inspired books in the Bible itself, pseudonymous. This is, as every student knows, or ought to know, a very different thing from calling them forgeries. That I regard this author as *un faussaire* (Spicq, p. lxxvi. n.),[1] or an 'intriguer' whose 'hocus-pocus may have been known to be such by his friends without lowering the shammer's character' (E. K. Simpson, p. 6)[2] simply is not true. I do not for a moment believe that he intended to deceive those for whom he wrote, or that they were in fact deceived by him. He was, in my view, a devout, sincere and earnest Paulinist who set out to express in this familiar form what he and his readers really believed the Apostle would have said had he been still alive. The mistaken idea that Paul himself wrote these Epistles arose later in the century, when their author was no longer there to correct it.

He had before him a collection of ten Pauline letters made at Ephesus about the turn of the century, and had steeped his mind in them to such an extent that he could and did embody in each of his three Epistles a number of phrases taken from each of those ten Paulines, and also a number of phrases recurring in two or more of them—as demonstrated in my Appendix II B. Incidentally this proves the existence of that collection at the time and place at which he wrote—Ephesus towards the end of Trajan's reign and the beginning of Hadrian's—and is our earliest conclusive evidence of this important fact.

He also had before him either the originals or good copies of several brief personal notes sent by the real Paul to the real Timothy and Titus. These he embodied in our 2 Timothy and Titus, as shown in my text (Appendix IV). 1 Timothy, the last of the three to be written, has the same abundance of Pauline phrases, but no such personal notes, as the other two.

In these two respects, and to this extent, the language of the Pastorals is indeed Paul's own. But for the rest they are written in the Hellenistic Greek of the first half of the second century, and include a number of words and phrases certainly current then, but not, so far as we know, current in Paul's day.

I am strengthened in my conviction of the soundness of this hypothesis (1) by the knowledge that it has the support of so many front-rank scholars both here and abroad, (2) by an evident weakening of the confidence with which some eminent conservative scholars still hold to the traditional opinion—notably my old teacher Walter Lock in the *International Critical Commentary* [1924], (3) by the inability even of those who reject this hypothesis to deny the facts on which it rests.

I take this opportunity to correct one small item. Unfortunately I somehow failed to detect a misprint in Moulton and Geden's *Concordance* (noted in their Corrigenda), and so included ὑβρίζω among the words occurring in 1 Timothy and elsewhere in the New Testament, but not in any Pauline, whereas of course this word occurs not in 1 Timothy but in 1 Th 2^2. So the number of different words found in the Pastorals but not in the Paulines is actually three hundred and five, not three hundred and six. Otherwise the considerable body of facts which I produced in support of our hypothesis stands after thirty-four years unshaken. No other hypothesis known to me seems to cover all these facts. And there is no fact known to me which seems in any way incompatible with this hypothesis.

But (4) as the result of my further inquiries in this field since my book was published, I can now produce fresh evidence of two kinds which seems to me to strengthen still further the case I presented in 1921. Both in their vocabulary and in their phraseology the Pastorals show even closer affinity with pagan Greek writings under Trajan and Hadrian than I was then able to demonstrate. Also I can now account more simply for those Personalia.

I. Vocabulary

The publication in 1940 of the new Liddell and Scott, and in 1952 of the improved fourth edition

[1] *Les Épitres Pastorales* [Paris, 1947].

[2] *The Pastoral Epistles* [1954].

of my friend Walter Bauer's great *Wörterbuch zum N.T.*, enabled me to fill up many gaps in my acquaintance with the 'Hellenistic' Greek of our period (as exemplified not only in books but also in inscriptions and papyri), which I could never have filled without such help.

It is naturally always to be expected that a large majority of the words used by any ancient author will prove to have been in use for centuries before his time, and to have remained in use for centuries after him. On the other hand he is almost sure to have discarded some (comparatively) few terms that were current sixty years earlier, and adopted others which came into use during those same sixty years.

As I wrote (p. 65), 'the "critical view" does not rest on any contention that Paul was necessarily ignorant of all the words in question.' That he certainly knew and used eighteen of them (including *8 N.T. *Hapax Legomena*) in the one and two-thirds pages of the genuine notes preserved in 2 Timothy and Titus is shown in my text (Appendix IV). This is an average of 10·8 (including *4·8) per page—almost exactly the same as in our ten Paulines, as shown in my Diagrams II and I. There is nothing here to suggest a second century origin for these passages, or to raise any doubt of their Pauline authorship.

But what of the two hundred and eighty-seven distributed through the remaining twelve pages of the Pastorals? Two hundred and sixty of them do in fact occur in writings before or during Paul's lifetime or less than thirty years after his death. This is all we get, even if we include (*a*) the whole of our classical Greek literature from Homer and Æschylus to Aristotle and Demosthenes, and their immediate successors, (*b*) later writers of Hellenistic Greek before the Christian era, such as Polybius (ii. B.C.), Diodorus Siculus and Dionysius Halicarnassus (i. B.C.), (*c*) contemporaries of our Apostle like Strabo and Philo, (*d*) the whole of the Septuagint, (*e*) inscriptions and papyri dated before A.D. 90.

With this very large body of writers we can now compare the much smaller body of those who were on our hypothesis roughly contemporary with the author of the Pastorals, from Josephus, whose *Antiquities* were finished A.D. 93, Dioscorides and Cleomedes to Marcus Aurelius, Lucian, Vettius Valens and Pollux, plus inscriptions and papyri of this period and in one case Porphyry (iii. A.D.).

Here we find no fewer than two hundred and seventy-three of our two hundred and eighty-seven words—thirteen more than in all the rest of Greek literature put together.

Nine words I must still admit my inability to find in either period, *ἀφθορία*, *ἀφιλάγαθος*, *διαπαρατριβή*, *ἑδραίωμα* (Letter of the churches of Vienne and Lyons, *c.* A.D. 177, Eusebius, *H.E.*, I. v .17, where the phrase *στῦλον καὶ ἑδραίωμα αὐτων* is usually taken as an echo of 1 Ti 3^{15}), *ἐκζήτησις*, *καλοδιδάσκαλος*, *καταστρηνιάω* (Pseudo-Ignatius, ad Antioch. 11), *λογομαχέω* (*λογομαχία* was used by the Latin author Varro as title of a Satire, by Conon i. B.C./i. A.D., according to Photius ix. A.D., and twice by Porphyry), *συγκακοπαθέω*. The appearance of these in the Pastorals seems to be unique, though we find in our period close cognates or very similar word formations to all or most of them (see my p. 83 f.).

The *spelling* of three more in our best MSS. seems to be unique, *μητρολῴας*, *πατρολῴας* and *καυστηριάζομαι* which appear in both periods as *μητραλοίας*, *πατραλοίας* and *καυτηριάζομαι* If we include the three just mentioned, two hundred and fifty-five occur in both periods—classical words naturally more often in the classics, but some others, which make only a single or very rare appearance in the earlier period, occur much more frequently, and in a number of different authors, in the second century. Thus *ἀνεξίκακος* occurs in Justin, Athenagoras, Vettius Valens, Lucian, Herodian, Aretæus, Pollux and second-century papyri. Against this array, Oribasius in the fourth century quotes the otherwise hardly known medical writer Herodotus somewhere in the first century as using this word. Other examples are *ἀνυπότακτος*, *βαθμός*, *κατάστημα* and *νεωτερικός*.

Only five words appear in the earlier but not in the later period—*νεόφυτος* is in a fragment from Æschylus, in papyri, Philo and the LXX, of a newly planted vine or tree, but nowhere in its metaphorical sense = a new adherent, as in 1 Ti 3^{6}. *ὀρθοτομέω* only in the LXX, Pr 3^{6}, 11^{5}, where it means to direct one's way, or (literally), cut a straight path before him. Only in 2 Ti 2^{15} has it the metaphorical meaning = rightly divide or handle aright the word of truth. *ἔλεγμος*, too, is exclusively in the LXX, where it has a variety of meanings, but in Sir 21^{6}, 35 $(32)^{17}$ = 'reproof,' as in 2 Ti 3^{16}. *ἐπιδιορθόω* appears only in a Greek dialect inscription (Hieropytna, ii. B.C.), and Tit 1^{5}. Finally, *διδακτικός* is used by Philodemus rhet. (i. B.C.) and by Philo. We know that the author of the Pastorals had studied the Septuagint, for he quotes it 1 Ti $5^{18f.}$ (2 Ti 2^{19}? cf. Lock, *ad loc.*), Tit 2^{14}, and refers to it 2 Ti $3^{8.\ 18}$. I am strongly inclined to think he had read Philo, for he shares with that writer an exceptionally large number both of words and of phrases. That St. Paul had read Philo seems more than doubtful. The combined weight of these five words, as telling in favour of the Pauline authorship of these Epistles, is surely negligible.

It is certainly far outweighed by the following facts :—

(1) Against Philo's one hundred and sixty-five Dio Chrysostom has one hundred and forty and Epictetus one hundred and thirty, both in very much smaller compass, while Plutarch has two hundred and seventeen (*109).

(2) Nearly a score of these words appear in writers of our period, some of them in several different authors, and in these repeatedly, but not, so far as I can discover, in any writing prior to A.D. 90. *ἀνεπαίσχυντος* is in Josephus's *Antiquities* and in Agapetus, *ἀντίλυτρον* in Zenobius and Polyaenus (also in Orphica Lithica, date unknown = antidote), *γάγγραινα* in Dioscorides, Plutarch, Soranus, Galen—also Hippocrates, but in a section, *Μοχλικόν* 33, of dubious authenticity, according to Stuart Jones, who gave me much valuable help thirty years ago. *δίλογος* is in Polycarp (also Pollux, but according to W. Bauer = *wiederholend*), *διώκτης* in Barnabas and the Didache, *ἐπισωρεύω* in Barnabas, Plutarch, Epictetus, Artemidorus Daldianus, Vettius Valens, Nichomachus and Phrynichus Soph., *ἑτεροδιδασκαλέω* in Ignatius, *εὐμετάδοτος* in Marcus Aurelius and eight times in Vettius Valens, *ἤρεμος* in Athenagoras (*cit.* 1 Ti 2^2), Zenobius, Lucian (also in a var. lectio of Cod. A Esther 3^{13b} for the *ἥμερος* of other MSS.), *θεόπνευστος* in Plutarch and Vettius Valens (also Pseudo-Phocyl., i. A.D. (?) and Orac. Sib., date unknown), *κενοφωνία* in Dioscorides, *νομοδιδάσκαλος* in Luke–Acts (still Jewish), *ξενοδοχέω* in Phrynichus, Maximus Tyrius and Moeris (late Hellenistic for the classical *ξενοδοκέω*. In my old copy of the *Poetae Scenici Graeci*, ed. Dindorf [1851], I find *τολμᾷς ξενοδοχειν*; Euripides, *Alcestis*, 552, but in the new Liddell and Scott this is quoted with a κ). *οἰκοδεσποτέω* is in Plutarch, Vettius Valens, Phrynichus, Pseudo-Lucian and papyri, *οἰκουργός* in Soranus (for the classical *οἰκουρός*, which appears in inferior MSS. Tit 2^5), *πρεσβυτέριον* in Ignatius (Luke–Acts of the Jewish body), Theodotion (ii. A.D.), Susannah 50 = honour or privilege of an Elder, *πρόκριμα* in two ii. A.D. papyri (and an inscription dated by Liddell and Scott Sparta ii. A.D., but by Bauer ii. B.C.), *ὑψηλοφρονέω* in Pollux (also in the *Textus Receptus* Ro 11^{20} where, however, ℵ, P^{46} etc., read *μὴ ὑψηλὰ φρόνει*, and so modern editors).

All this is just what we might reasonably expect if we knew for certain that these three Epistles were written under Trajan and Hadrian. It is to my mind quite inexplicable if we assume their Pauline authorship.

II. Phraseology

Reviewing Spicq, *Les Épitres Pastorales* in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (XLIX [1948], 208), I wrote 'Words have a long life, but current phrases have a much shorter vogue. A few such as "going off the deep end," "getting the wind up," and "being up against it," would create serious doubts about any document purporting to have been written *c.* A.D. 1863–7.' I then gave a few instances of phrases and word combinations shared by the Pastorals with pagan Greek writings of our period. I now submit a larger selection, omitting further examples to save space.

(1) *μύθοις* (*Ἰουδαϊκοῖς*) *προσέχειν* 1 Ti 1^4, Tit 1^{14}, Plutarch, *τοῖς Αἰσωπικοῖς μύθοις προσέχοντες*. id. *τὰ γὰρ παρ' ἐκείνοις* (*τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις*) *λεγόμενα μύθοις ἔοικεν*.

(2) *ἤρεμον βίον διάγειν* 1 Ti 2^2, Zenobius (under Hadrian), *Βοιωτοὶ πρότερον βίον ἄλυπον καὶ ἤρεμον ἔχοντες*. Inscription iii. A.D. *ἤρεμον καὶ γαληνον τὸν βίον διαγόντων*.

(3) *ἱματισμὸς πολυτελής* 1 Ti 2^9, Plutarch *ἱματισμὸν πολυτελῆ*.

(4) *κόσμιος, φιλόξενος* 1 Ti 3^2, Epictetus *τὸν πιστὸν, τὸν φιλόξενον, τὸν κόσμιον*.

(5) *ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ εἶναι* 1 Ti 2^{12}, Dio Chrysostom *ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ τινα ὄντα*. Plutarch, *ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ τιθέμενος*. Artemidorus, *ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ γένοιντο*.

(6) *ταῦτα μελέτα, ἐν τούτοις ἴσθι* 1 Ti 4^{15}, Epictetus *ταῦτα ἔδει μελετᾶν . . . ἐν τούτοις γυμνάζεσθαι*. id. *Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω πολλάκις. ταῦτα μελετᾶτε*.

(7) *χωρὶς προκρίματος* 1 Ti 5^{21}. Three times in a papyrus dated *c.* A.D. 172.

(8) *τοὺς ἰδίους δεσπότας* 1 Ti 6^1. Zenobius, *ἐπὶ τῶν . . . τοῦς ἰδίους δεσπότας, ὡς ἐπιμελουμένους, ἀφορώντων*.

(9) *αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός* 1 Ti 2^{12}. Mich. Glykas (cit. by W. Bauer) *αἱ γυναῖκες αὐθεντοῦσι τῶν ἀνδρῶν*. Dio Chrysostom, *ἐγυναικοκρατοῦντο οἱ Ἀτρεῖδαι*. Cases of women being 'allowed dominion over men' also in Proclus and in Arrian.

(10) *τῶν καρπῶν μεταλαμβάνειν* 2 Ti 2^6. Zenobius, *εἷς δὲ τῶν οἰκέτων ἔφη μὴ μεταλήψεσθαι τὸν δεσπότην τοῦ καρποῦ*.

(11) *ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον προκόπτειν* 2 Ti 3^{13}. Josephus, *B.J.*, *τὰ . . . τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων πάθη προῦκοπτε καθ' ἡμέραν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον. Ant. προκοπτόντων πάντων ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον*. Zenobius *κατὰ τῶν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον προκοπτόντων ἀεί*.

(12) *ἔχοντες διατροφάς . . .* 1 Ti 6^8. Epictetus, '*ἐὰν ἀμελήσω τῶν ἐμῶν, οὐχ ἕξω διατροφάς*.' Dio Chrysostom, *τινὰς δὲ αὐτῶν μὴ ἀρκεῖσθαι τοῖς παροῦσι, ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ τὰ πορρωτέρω διατείνειν τὰς χεῖρας*.

(13) *σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως ζῆν* Tit 2^{12}. Dio Chrysostom, *δικαίως ζῆν καὶ φρονίμως καὶ σωφρόνως*. Plutarch, *τὸ δ' εὖ ζῆν ἐστι κοινωνικῶς ζῆν καὶ φιλικῶς καὶ σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως*.

(14) *φιλάνδρους, φιλοτέκνους* Tit 2^4. Marble tombstone of Otakilia Polla (Pergamum, time of

Hadrian, cit. Deissmann, *L.v.O.*[4], p. 267 f.) *ΤΗ ΓΛΥΚΥΤΑΤΗ ΓΥΝΑΙΚΙ ΦΙΛΑΝΔΡΩ ΚΑΙ ΦΙΛΟΤΕΚΝΩ ΣΥΜΒΙΩΣΑΣΗ ΑΜΕΜΠΤΩΣ ΕΤΗ Λ̄.* Plutarch *φιλότεκνοι καὶ φίλανδροι.*

All these are in addition to the ten instances given in my Appendix I, p. 165, where to my quotation of Galen as using the cliché *νομίμως ἀθλεῖν* = 'play the game' (as in 2 Ti 2^5) I can now add Epictetus *εἰ νομίμως ἠθλησας.*

III. Occasions and Number of Genuine Notes

On one question, to which it is in the nature of things extremely difficult to be quite sure that we have found the right answer, I now see my way to suggest a simplification of my original theory which seems to me, and I hope will seem to other scholars, a real improvement. The question is, when did Paul write those personal notes to Timothy and Titus now embodied in these Epistles, and how many of them are there? In 1921 I answered five, one to Titus and four to Timothy. Now I think there are three, one to Titus, but only two to Timothy, all consisting of the same verses in Titus and 2 Timothy as before, but distributed somewhat differently.

1. Tit 3^{12-15}. Paul cannot, of course, have written this 'from Nicopolis of Macedonia' (as stated in the old note appended to Titus in the T.R. and A.V., but rightly omitted from the R.V.). For, if so, he must have written 'here,' not 'there.' But there might be a case for holding that it was to Macedonia that Titus was summoned, if we knew that there really was a town so named in that land. Holtzmann (*P.B.*, p. 21 and n.) says there was, offering no proof, but referring to Krenkel: Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexicon*, iv. S. 328. I have not seen Krenkel's article, and do not know of any ancient authority on this point. Most moderns deny that there was such a place. So I still agree, as on my p. 115 ff., that in all probability it was at Nicopolis in Epirus that Paul was 'comforted by the coming of Titus' (2 Co 7^6).

2. 2 Ti 4^{9-15}, with its postscript *vv.* 20, 21a and benediction *v.* 22b perhaps on the verso, anyhow separate from the rest, may well have been written at Nicopolis soon after Titus, having joined Paul there, had gone on to Dalmatia, presumably to follow up Paul's own recent visit to Illyricum (Ro 15^{19}). It must have been after this, but before (or with) 2 Co 1–9, that Titus returned to Corinth ($8^{16ff.}$).

In 1921 I still believed, as most New Testament scholars did then, that our 'prison letters' were all written during the Roman imprisonment recorded in Acts. From this it followed inevitably that 2 Ti 4^{9-12}, reporting the defection of Demas, must belong to a note written from Rome some time after the dispatch of Colossians and Philemon, in both of which Demas is still with the Apostle, and sends his greetings to the recipients. This must, therefore, be a different note from 4^{13-15}, etc., in which Paul has recently been at Troas, and Timothy needs to be told of the harm done to Paul at Ephesus by Alexander the coppersmith, and warned against this dangerous person.

But during the last twenty-six years, thanks largely to Duncan (*St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry* [1929]), the idea that our 'prison letters' may have been written during one, two or even three imprisonments at Ephesus, or in that region, has been widely discussed, and is now held in one form or another by a large and growing body of experts, though it is not yet generally accepted.

My reasons for believing that Philemon and most of Colossians (and a letter to the Laodiceans —Col 4^{16}—now long lost) were written by Paul as a prisoner towards the end of his Ephesian ministry are given in my article on Onesimus and Philemon in the *Anglican Theological Review* for October 1950, and cannot be repeated in the limited space available here. On this assumption there is clearly no longer any need to regard 2 Ti 4^{9-12} and $^{13-15}$ as two different notes. These verses with their postscript *vv.* 20, 21a, stressing Paul's loneliness and need for more helpers, all belong together. The postscript refers to Paul's brief, 'sorrowful,' second visit to Corinth (2 Co $13^{1f.}$ *ὡς παρὼν τὸ δεύτερον*), whence he will have returned to Ephesus *via* Miletus for the reason explained on my p. 120 f. Soon after that he left Ephesus for the last time, and went *via* Troas into Macedonia. That Erastus did 'stay on at Corinth' is confirmed by Ro 16^{23}.

3. 2 Ti 1^{16-18}, $3^{10.\ 11}$, $4^{1.\ 2a.\ 5b-8.\ 16-19}$, with postscript and benediction *vv.* 21b, 22a on the verso, is Paul's Last Letter as before, only now it includes 4^{16-18}.

I have definitely given up the idea that Paul wrote this passage at Cæsarea, and that his 'first defence' means his speech on the stairs at Jerusalem (Ac 22^1), and am now convinced that it refers to the preliminary hearing (*prima actio*) before Nero and Tigellinus in or about A.D. 62, when Tigellinus had succeeded Burrus as chief of the prætorian guard (Tac., *Ann.* xiv. 51 f.).

So these verses belong to Paul's 'testament and swan song,' from which our author introduces one paragraph after another, with expansions of his own for the Timothys of his own day. I sometimes incline to think the original Last Letter may have begun with this account of his appearance (at long last!) before Caesar's judgment-seat, where, if anywhere on earth, he could say (giving Timothy credit for enough sense to refrain from taking his words too literally), that 'all the

nations might hear.' It may, however, be simpler to suppose that our author has followed throughout the order of paragraphs as he found it in the original letter.

Duncan's proposed alteration of ἐν Ῥώμῃ (1[17]) into ἐν Λαοδικίᾳ, to suit his theory of a *third* imprisonment in that area, is to my mind quite unacceptable.

I still think that most of Philippians—rid of obscurities at the beginning of ch. 3 and elsewhere, due surely to an editor—was written by Paul at Rome, and agree with C. H. Dodd (*New Testament Studies* [1953], 97) that there was 'ample time' during the two years of Ac 28[30] for all those journeys between Rome and Philippi on which Duncan and others base their strongest argument for a date early in Paul's Ephesian ministry.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

Coming Shortly

By H. F. Mathews, M.A., Ph.D., Alsager, Cheshire

'He that cometh.'—Mt 11[3] (R.V.).

My friends who are film fans have one great complaint. They say that the trailers advertising coming films always exaggerate the wonders they promise for the future. When this week's film is dull, the excerpt from next week's show promises 'the most stupendous, breath-taking, heart-rending spectacle ever presented on the screen.' But when next week comes, it turns out to be no better than before, only different. I am almost glad we have no cinema in our village!

For nearly eight hundred years the Hebrews looked forward to a king who should deliver them from the troubles they endured at the hands of each successive world-empire which ruled them. When the Syrians were attacking and Judah's kings were weak, Isaiah of Jerusalem promised that a descendant of David should come as 'Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God,' and throw back their enemies. When the Babylonians were threatening, Jeremiah promised a king whose name should be 'The Lord our Righteousness.' In exile, Ezekiel told the people that their 'shepherds' or religious leaders had failed, and God would raise up a new Shepherd to lead them. Later still, Zechariah spoke of the crown which the leader Zerubbabel should wear as God's representative.

But when God's Promised King came, He was far beyond the highest hopes of those who had spoken of His coming. They thought of a fighter; but Jesus was the Friend beyond compare. They thought of a prince; but Jesus never lived in a palace. No one thought of a Messiah who would heal men's broken bodies, or touch the filthy flesh of outcast lepers, or make way among His disciples for a despised tax collector, or tell the most wonderful parable stories, or suffer and die for the men He loved. For this once, the 'trailers' have not told us one hundredth part of the wonder of Him who should come!

The Message of Christmas

By the Reverend Douglas Stewart, M.A., Pinner

'And it was at Jerusalem the feast of the dedication, and it was winter. And Jesus walked . . . in Solomon's porch. . . . I and my Father are one.'—Jn 10[22. 23. 30].

1. One hundred and sixty-seven years before the birth of Jesus a terrible thing had happened in the Temple in Jerusalem. A foreign king, called Antiochus Epiphanes, who had conquered the Jews, determined to destroy their religion. And he went about it in an abominable way. He took a pig—and you know that for the Jews the pig has always been an unclean animal—and offered it as a sacrifice on the altar. This made both the Temple and the altar unclean so that the Jewish worship was impossible there.

But, as so often happens, Antiochus soon found that he had gone too far. The Jews were so terribly angry that they revolted, drove him out of Jerusalem, and fought a successful war of liberation. Three years later—in 164 B.C.—the Temple was cleansed and rededicated.

Now we happen to know the exact day on which the Temple was rededicated. It was on the anniversary of its desecration by Antiochus and on the date of an ancient pagan festival. In our calendar the date is 25th December.

'And it was at Jerusalem the feast of the dedication,' the 25th of December, 'and it was winter. And Jesus walked in Solomon's porch.' This is the one time in the whole gospel story when we can actually know the day of the year. It was Jesus' birthday when He walked in the Temple. And now look at what He said.

2. '*I and my Father are one.*' It is natural on your birthday to talk about your birth and about your parents and family. But—and this is the message of Christmas—Jesus was different from

the rest of us. His Father, in a special way, was God. God was born into this world when Jesus was born at Bethlehem nineteen hundred years ago.

What does that mean to us to-day? Well, I wonder if you believe in Flying Saucers! Whether you do or don't there's one thing about which we must all agree. If a Flying Saucer—only one—were ever to land on our planet that would prove beyond shadow of doubt that somewhere else in the universe there is a race capable of building such things and of voyaging through space. One visit would conclusively prove the existence of another race.

Once in the history of humanity there came a Man to earth belonging to a higher, a better, race than the rest of us. When men asked Him to explain Himself, Jesus answered, 'I and my Father are one.' And so Jesus, by His birth amongst us, is the proof that God is, and that God is love. He has come to earth bearing God's nature and revealing the existence of a Kingdom of peace and love beyond this world. That was why the angels sang at His birth. That is why Christians have taught the world to rejoice at Christmas. That is why we rejoice to-day.

Sundays Only

By the Reverend John R. Gray, B.D., Th.M., Glasgow

'Daily . . . follow me.'—Lk 9[23].

Are you good at looking up railway time-tables? I'm not. The other Monday I was going quite a distance by train and I looked up the time-table and found a fast train which left just after breakfast. I thought that would be fine, but when I looked closer there was a wee [x] at it and after searching for a little I discovered that the wee [x] meant 'Saturdays only.' That wasn't any use, so I looked again and found one almost as suitable but a little earlier. It didn't have an [x]. It had a † and after a hunt I found that that meant 'Except Mondays.' That wasn't any use either. Then there were some trains marked X, which meant Wednesdays and Saturdays only. Finally it seemed that there was hardly one train left which went every day. I dare say British Railways do their best, but it is all very confusing. It would be so much easier if *every* train ran *every* day. We wouldn't make nearly so many mistakes.

It is a pity when trains aren't the same every day. It is a greater pity when people aren't. There are people, quite a lot of them, and boys and girls too, who are as different from one day to another as chalk is from cheese. One day they're kind. The next day they're cruel. One day they're happy. The next day they're miserable. One day they're good tempered. The next day they're cross. You just never know how you're going to find them. Just like the trains they're never the same two days running. There are even people, and boys and girls, who try to be good and follow Christ only on one day of the week. They might be called 'Sundays Only' Christians. They are not much use to Christ. He wants us to love and serve and follow Him not one day in the week, but every day. Do you remember what He said? 'Daily . . . follow me.'

The Christian Year

Christmas Day

Is Christmas Poetry or Fact?

By the Reverend Arthur Cowan, D.D., Edinburgh

'And, lo, thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument: for they hear thy words, but they do them not.'—Ezk 33[32].

The prophet's message was undervalued as mere poetic idealism. The truth he proclaimed had lyrical enchantment, but it was not assumed as sufficiently relevant and commanding to change the brutal facts of life. In Tudor times, when Lord Burleigh was ordered by Queen Elizabeth to give £100 to Edmund Spenser for some poems, he exclaimed: 'What! all this for a song?' He did not think it was worth the money, because in his opinion it was not practical politics and did not seem to count as a decisive force in human affairs. So the people of Ezekiel's day did not accept what he declared to be God's Word as of enough consequence to change their lives. It was regarded as engaging poetry not telling fact.

Similarly Christmas hymns and carols have the magic of the festive season, and make a special appeal. We love to hear them, but too many feel that they are only very lovely songs, part of the poetry and romance of the children's fairyland. When the Cold War was at its worst, *The Spectator* wrote about the approaching Christmas: 'The eyes of the imagination will involuntarily turn to Bethlehem. Amid the surrounding gloom we may find ourselves singing, with what assurance we may, "Yet in thy dark streets shineth The Everlasting Light." Even so, the gloom must seem more real than that, or any light.' This poses the question: 'Is Christmas poetry or fact?'

Now the defeatist mood is too common to-day, because many people are trying to retain the Christmas feeling of peace on earth and goodwill to men without believing in any Divine background and without any confidence in the Divine character and purpose behind ugly appearances.

Christmas seems too beautiful to be true, because they are not sure of the active wisdom and power of God as the saving leverage beyond the human dislocation. They become plaintive, they feel pessimistic and helpless amid the wicked disorder, because they lack the exhilarating certainty that God is not merely an onlooker behind the scenes, but has come forward once for all as the Saviour born at Bethlehem.

Dorothy Sayers, in her play *Kings in Judaea*, makes one of the Wise Men say at the cradle in the stable : ' I speak for the sorrowful people. We rise up to labour and lie down to sleep ; and night is only a pause between one burden and another. Fear is our daily companion, fear of want, the fear of war, the fear of cruel death and still more cruel life. But all this we could bear if we knew we did not suffer in vain ; that God was beside us in the struggle, sharing the miseries of His own world.'

Christmas is not poetry but fact, and the fact is God's historic intervention at the Nativity in the villainous muddle of life. This is a challenge to unbelief, a thrilling proof that God does not merely stand by but comes to the rescue of our struggling lives to fight along with us, and to win.

If it seems hard to credit that the infinite magnitude of God could be compressed in a single person, the Infant at Bethlehem, it should be realized that the sum total of God was not confined to the cradle in a manger. The throne of the universe did not become vacant for the time being and the world was not left without any one in charge of its cosmic concerns. God did not cease to reign and reveal Himself elsewhere when Jesus was born to redeem mankind. The whole of God's thoughts and energies were not incorporated in the Incarnate Son. It was God's saving love, the side of Him which is occupied with human contacts and personal encounters, that was embodied in the Christ Child and it disclosed how tenderly God involves Himself in human destiny. This is not poetic idealism, ' a very lovely song,' a carolled legend, but historic fact.

The fact is comforting and rallying, because it reveals that God is not solitary but sociable. It is good news that God is so communicative, so eager to make Himself understood and available to groping, blinded folk. ' His delight is with the sons of men,' and He does not avoid them even in their most squalid lapses, but cannot be satisfied till He gets among them with His saving power. That is why it is appropriate that this should be a season of family gatherings, when relatives and friends meet to enjoy one another and cultivate the ties of kinship and affection. But the Divine aim is not merely to be an agreeable companion ; it is to be a redeeming power. His friendliness, which comes among us at Bethlehem, is not merely bonhomie or geniality, like a jolly song sung in a prison from which there is no escape, but a liberating love. He arrives on the first Christmas morning to set the captive free.

Not poetry but fact ! Yes, and the fact revealed is an undeserved love which we could never earn or claim as our right. It is love for the unlovable, the uninteresting, the unfit, the unworthy. Brunner's words are apposite. ' What we call love is always conditional self-giving, whether it be mother's love or love of country : love limited by some secret demand for compensation or some relic of exclusiveness ; never unconditional. But God loves us without any conditions at all. His will is to *give*, to give His life to man, give salvation, satisfaction, blessedness. He claims us for His love, that we may belong to His purpose of absolute love for the world and man.' That Divine love became domesticated in the Babe of Bethlehem, when the eternal God stepped into time, intervened visibly in history to reveal the dimensions of His compassion and to create in us compassionate hearts, eager to befriend and succour hapless lives as He has done. This must not be devalued as poetry, ' a very lovely song,' but must be estimated as valid fact to the glory of God.

The Incarnation is a fact which it is not easy for self-important natures to welcome. It is a rebuke to pride and puts the complacent as well as the arrogant mentality to shame. Born in a stable, cradled in a manger ! So humbly did Divine love steal into human life that it should cure people of any sneering sense of superiority to others. Florence Nightingale left her snug home to nurse wounded soldiers amid the wretchedness and horror of the Crimea, but on her outward journey, when Boulogne was reached, the ladies in her party would not sit with her small company of nurses at dinner, because in those days nurses had a low status. Miss Nightingale herself waited on the nurses and ate along with them, and one of them said to her : ' We never had so much care taken of our comforts before. It is not people's way with us.' But it was Florence Nightingale's way, and it gave nurses a new standing, a higher dignity, when she showed that they should be respected and not despised. That was an echo of the Incarnation of God's Son, who humbled Himself and took the form of a servant that He might exalt human creatures to a higher position and make them worthy of honour.

All this is not poetry but fact, on which we can depend and which will bear the weight of all our fears, all our tears, and all our years, and carry us through the blizzard of events to triumph at last. Christmas is a gracious time when we should thank God and take courage.

This is the season of presents and greetings

when we express ourselves affectionately. It should also be a season when we feel our unpayable indebtedness to God's love, and our gratitude for His magnificent self-bestowal should make us generous. Christmas should be not only a jovial time but a kind time, when the heart is touched by the unfortunate, the neglected, the lonely, and seeks to cheer them with some of the festive joy, and to love them as God in Christ has loved us. Our service to those who are down, our helpfulness to those who cannot help themselves, will convince the outsider that Christmas is not merely poetry, lyrical escapism, but a life-changing fact, and will recognize that Christ has indeed come.

SUNDAY AFTER CHRISTMAS

New Year

BY THE LATE PROFESSOR D. M. BAILLIE, D.D., OF ST. ANDREWS

'Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches: But let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise lovingkindness, judgment, and righteousness, in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the Lord.'—Jer $9^{23, 24}$.

In that remarkable book *Revolt in the Desert* by T. E. Lawrence there is a passage which may be taken as a kind of introduction to this text.

One night in the summer of 1917, while the First Great War was raging, Colonel Lawrence was out in the Arabian desert with his mixed force of Arabs. He and a few of the chiefs were sitting on their carpets around a camp fire under the stars. One of the Arabs began lazily to look at the stars through Lawrence's field-glasses. 'And the stars—what are they?' someone asked. That set them talking of the suns beyond suns and of how, when telescopes were still further improved, thousands upon thousands of new stars would be discovered; until, as one of the Arabs then said, 'When we see them all, there will be no night in heaven.' Then another of the Arabs broke in impatiently: 'Why are the Westerners always wanting everything? Behind our few stars we can see God, and He is not to be found beyond your millions.' Then the questioning imaginative one began again: 'Are there men on these greater worlds? And has each one got the Prophet, and Heaven, and Hell?' But the impatient one broke in again: 'Lads, we know our districts and our camels and our women. . . . The rest is God's and the glory is God's. If the end of wisdom is to add star to star, our foolishness is better.' And he immediately turned the conversation to the subject of money, until all the tongues began to buzz at once.

In that quiet hour under the stars, on the sand of the Arabian desert, those men were thinking thoughts that did not often come to them. They saw themselves and all their world so little in the midst of the great universe, and they began to ask themselves unusual questions about God and the universe and what things are really worth while for man in this world.

That is precisely what we think about sometimes as we watch the passing of an old year and the coming of a new. At twelve o'clock last night this earth of ours, sailing through space, completed another of its long journeys round the sun, as we measure them on our calendar. We little creatures living on its surface have completed another year of our short existence on this earth. Perhaps some of you woke up this New Year's morning asking questions, in the light of these immensities and eternities, as to what the meaning of life really is and what things are really worth while for us men and women upon earth.

And the answer, for us, and for those Arabs of the desert, comes in the words of our text, in the words of an old Oriental prophet, who spoke in a language much more like theirs than like ours.

Think of each of the clauses of the text in turn, taking that desert scene as a background.

1. *Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom.* The wisest men never do it. But there is a sense in which we are very apt to do it in the modern world. The progress of scientific knowledge has been a very wonderful thing in modern times. But the old Arab asked: 'What will happen with this increasing knowledge?' 'When we see all the stars, there will be no night in heaven'—and he meant that there would be no room left for mystery, for God. If that was to be the ultimate end of all our Western wisdom, they didn't want it. Well, these were foolish Arabs with timid lazy Oriental minds. We don't want that; we want knowledge, we want truth.

But wasn't there some truth in what they said? Quite a number of Eastern countries are being flooded with European scientific teaching which is breaking up their old religions and putting nothing positive in their place. And the result is disastrous—either sheer materialism, or, worse still, a new and more dangerous paganism. But the same danger exists even in Christian countries like our own. In this twentieth century we need very badly to learn over again the lesson that progress in every other kind of knowledge is a poor thing unless it goes with the knowledge of God. It would be good for us to pray the beautiful prayer written by Francis Bacon, the founder of modern science and philosophy: 'We humbly and earnestly ask that human things may not prejudice such as are divine, so that from the opening of the gates of sense and the kindling of a greater natural light,

nothing of incredulity or intellectual might may arise in our minds towards divine mysteries; but rather, O Lord, that our minds being thoroughly cleansed and purged from fancy, and yet subject to the divine will, there may be given unto faith the things that are faith's, that so we may continually attain to a deeper knowledge and love of Thee.'

2. *Let not the mighty man glory in his might.* There are two thoughts that sometimes chasten and subdue men when they are tempted to glory in their might. The one is the kind of thought that came to men in the desert under the stars—the sense of the immensity of this material universe, dwarfing man into insignificance. 'When I consider the heavens—the moon and the stars—what is man?' And the other kindred thought is the one that comes to us at the passing of the old year—the sense of the length of eternity and the brevity of human life.

When we are young we feel as if we had endless time stretching out in front of us on earth. When we are in the full flush of our powers and activities we have a sense of mastery and self-sufficiency in the universe, and we sometimes try to do without God. We are ready to glory in our might. But at the passing of an old year, we realise vividly that our time is passing.

Now that does not mean tragedy and defeat for those who really believe in the gospel. It is not sad for Christian men and women; because God has given us eternal life; and we can think quite calmly and gladly of the brevity of life. But without that—without God, without Christ, without the meaning He gives to life, without anything to glory in but our own might, and our selfish use of it—New Year's Day must be one of the saddest days in all the year.

3. *Let not the rich man glory in his riches.* That is the commonest danger of all, and not only for the rich man, but for the ordinary man.

Those Arabs were speaking of the stars and God and His glory, but very soon the conversation turned round to money, and presently the Arab who had been talking of giving the glory to God began whispering to Colonel Lawrence about the reward he hoped to get from King Feisul when the campaign was over. That was rather an anti-climax. But it is so true to life. It so often comes back to that in the end—material gain and prosperity. That is the great snare: to become wholly absorbed in the business of making a good living, without even stopping to ask yourself what you are living for. Jeremiah saw people doing that when he wrote this text. Jesus saw people doing it, and He spoke sadly of how people got obsessed with 'the cares of this world and the deceitfulness of riches,' so that they had no time to think of God's Kingdom.

But that kind of life is so poor I hardly need stop to point out its poverty. If you've got nothing more than that out of the year, you have got nothing out of it at all.

4. We come at last to the one thing worth while. *But he that glorieth, let him glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise lovingkindness, judgment and righteousness in the earth: for in these things do I delight, saith the Lord.* Jeremiah wrote these words between two and three thousand years ago in Palestine, and they still stand in all their simplicity and profundity; and we cannot go beyond them—except that we can put a yet deeper and brighter meaning into them through the gospel of Jesus; as Paul did when he said: 'God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ.'

As an old year passes and a new year comes, don't these things stand out as the things that matter: to know God, to have Him as our Father and our friend, to get His lovingkindness and righteousness into our hearts, so that it overflows into our lives? What else matters? And above all in this unstable terrifying modern world, what else matters?

We can begin the year with gladness and look forward into it with hope, if we have—*God*, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. God is working His purpose out. God's counsel standeth for ever. God's Kingdom cannot fail. And God calls us into the fellowship and service of His Kingdom, that in this bewildering modern world we may live as His sons and daughters, working with Him for the good of mankind, with His love in our hearts.

That gives life a meaning. That makes life worth living. Therefore I wish you all a good New Year.

First Sunday after Epiphany

Co-existence or Christian Community?

By the Reverend D. H. C. Read, M.A., B.D., Edinburgh

'If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth: but if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.'—1 Jn$^{6.\ 7}$.

'Hell,' says a character in one of Sartre's plays, 'is other people.' This is a remark that throws a judgment-light on our generation. Let me alone. Don't bother me with other people—their ideas, their rights, their claims, their habits. Isn't this a prevailing mood? It looks as though, just

because the circumstances of our time have made us all more closely interdependent than ever before, we are developing a mechanism of self-defence, a resentment against the encroachment of others.

We find this in the home. We find it in civic and public life, in all societies and institutions, where there is a paralysing of interest and leadership. Hell is other people with their demand that I should go and vote in a municipal election, take an interest in the United Nations, bother about race-discrimination. Leave me to my private heaven : I don't want other people, unless in the darkened anonymity of the two-and-ninepennies. And so it is when we come to the international scene. Hell is other nations—the Russians, the Americans, the Chinese. It is a symbol of our panic retreat from other people that the best we can hope for is expressed not in the word of our text—fellowship, community, *koinonia*—but in that cold and morally-empty word—co-existence. This may well be the best practical policy open to our statesmen to-day (this is not the place to make such a judgment) but the word is surely a judgment on an entire attitude to life. We co-exist in our families ; we co-exist in our city ; we co-exist in our nation ; we co-exist in the world. This is the formula by which we come to terms with the hell which is other people.

' If we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we co-exist with one another.' No ; the Christian gospel has another word, and the Christian Church has another message. The word is *koinonia*, which we translate ' fellowship ' or ' community,' neither of which is to-day strong and clear enough to indicate the power and vitality of the new thing that God created among us in Jesus Christ. It was this more than anything else that made the Christian impact on the ancient world. ' See how these Christians love one another.' We forget that this phrase, so often quoted cynically to-day, was originally the tribute of the pagan world to the new fellowship in their midst.

If we can disentangle this word ' fellowship ' from its tepid association with tea-and-buns, and the word ' community ' from all kinds of closed circles and societies, we may be able to capture something of the meaning of the Christian *koinonia*.

'. . . As He is in the light.' The Christian community is based upon the Christian God. This is not such a simple and obvious statement as it sounds. The Holy Trinity is the source of our community ; for in the Christian God we can find the outgoing love that is its motive power. The love of the Father for the Son in the fellowship of the Spirit constitutes the eternal light of God, the source of all our being. And the Christian gospel on which our Christian community is based proclaims that the light of God the Father shone upon earth in the face of Jesus Christ His Son. This is the meaning of Advent : ' Arise, shine ; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee.'

' If we walk in the light, as he is in the light. . . .' None of us can say that we know nothing of this light which is the source of true community. The light may have been one that shone on our path and guided us when we were getting lost. It may have been a light that entered the secret place of our own soul to bring healing and forgiveness. It may have been a light that flamed out in judgment, even as a shaft of sunlight can reveal the impurities of the atmosphere. For some of us the experience of Christ has been so clear and compelling that walking in the light has clear implications of prayer and trust and obedience and worship. Others may be more in the position of Christian in the *Pilgrim's Progress* long before he came to a clear understanding of the faith. ' Then said Evangelist, pointing with his finger over a very wide field, Do you see yonder Wicket-gate ? The man said, No. Then said the other, Do you see yonder shining light ? He said, I think I do. Then said Evangelist, Keep that light in your eye.'

Here is the secret of Christian community. The late Professor Donald Baillie in his book, *God was in Christ*, has a beautiful myth to illustrate this point. ' I would tell a tale of God calling His children to form a great circle for the playing of His game. In that circle we ought all to be standing, facing toward the Light in the centre, which is God . . . seeing our fellow-creatures all round the circle in the light of that central love which shines on them and beautifies their faces ; and joining with them in the dance of God's great game, the rhythm of love universal. But instead of that we have, each one, turned our backs upon God and the circle of our fellows, and faced the other way so that we can see neither the Light at the centre nor the faces on the circumference. And, indeed, in that position it is even difficult to join hands with our fellows ! Therefore instead of playing God's game, we play, each one our selfish little game, like the perverse children Jesus saw in the market place who would not join in the dance with their companions.'

' Hell is other people ' ? On the contrary, we see now how the truth is rather contained in the words of Milton's Satan :

> Which way I fly is Hell ; myself am Hell ;
> And, in the lowest deep, a lower deep
> Still threatening to devour me opens wide.

The Christian community means an escape from the tyranny and monotony of isolated self to find the true self in fellowship with others in the light.

Are we really experiencing this fellowship as we ought to? This is not a society that we can bring into being. We *have* fellowship. We don't create it. But we may be obscuring it. Would it not be true to say that Christian societies in a university—Student Christian Movement, Christian Union, Evangelical Union, Anglican Union, and other movements and groupings—really lived in a state of co-existence rather than fellowship? We all know that religious societies and Church denominations have their differences of tradition and conviction, and the time is not yet when we can simply say that the differences do not matter. They are often profound and important. But nothing is profounder or more important than this prior fact that 'in Christ' we have fellowship one with another. To recognize this is joy and obedience: to obscure it is sin.

No one can draw a circle and say: 'You are in the Christian Community' and 'You are not.' It is a fellowship whose centre is Christ—'God of God, Light of Light'—and it seeks to draw all men and women towards that light. The nearer we are to that central light the more we are committed to the Community, but no one can say at what point the light ceases to shine.

'If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another . . .', but the text does not end there. 'And the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.' This is not just a kind of pious postscript to a straightforward text: it goes right to the heart of our practical problems of living together in Christian community. For we know that it is not enough for us simply to have a vision of what life can be when we are turned towards the centre, knowing one another in the light of Christ. We need some power to make that vision real, to lift us from the hell that is our isolation, to turn us from our sin towards the light.

To belong to the Christian Community means more than having a vague desire to follow the light of Christ. It means acknowledging our sin—that we have broken the fellowship with God and with other people—and humbly receiving the pardon and cleansing that He offers us in Christ. 'The blood of Jesus Christ his Son' means that life, that perfect life, poured out for us on the Cross. The cleansing of our sin, the continual forgiveness of which we stand in need, cannot be our achievement: it is the gift of God through Jesus Christ our Lord. The Christ who stands in the centre is not only light; He is the Saviour who alone can purge us, and empower us, by the offering of Himself.

Here, then, is the Christian picture of our human life—in ourselves, in our homes, in the State, in the world. A community of which the centre is the light of the triune God shining on earth in the face of Jesus Christ, into which we are all invited, there to receive cleansing for our sins; there to find our true selves; there to discover one another. This is religion in action, not just a private theory about God.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY

Three Questions

BY THE REVEREND E. L. ALLEN, PH.D., D.D., KING'S COLLEGE, NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE

'The Lord God called unto the man, and said unto him, Where art thou?'—Gn 3^9 (R.V.).

Ours is an age of questioning, so that we approach the Bible with such questions as: Is this true? What does that mean for to-day? But the Bible does not wait to be questioned by us, for it has questions of its own that it puts to us. It calls us into God's presence and summons us to obedience. To be sure, it has room also for our questions, for our doubt and uncertainty, even for our expostulation and complaint. Let us therefore take three questions from the Bible, the first two addressed to us by God, and the third one that we address to Him, and see how they are answered.

1. The first question is in our text. The Bible begins with man's sin and the shame that follows on his sin. Ashamed, he seeks to hide himself. But the God against whom he has sinned pursues him and will not allow him to escape. The question: 'Where art thou?' rings through Eden. Yes, and it goes echoing down the centuries ever since, summoning each man to accept responsibility for his own life before God. There is no concealment from Him, there is no place where He is not. Our deeds are our own and we must face the consequences, be they good or evil. We are responsible, each for himself.

Our generation reproduces Adam's folly. It offers the same excuse, that somebody or something else is to blame. There is a widespread notion that the fault lies with our economic circumstances; had we only been better situated in this respect, we should have done quite differently. Some have a smattering of psychology that enables them to shift the blame on to their parents; others have picked up a certain amount of medical jargon and talk wisely of glandular secretions. But conscience will not accept any of these glib excuses. It searches us out and tracks us down. 'Where art thou?' it asks, and it insists that we personally are to blame, not some one else.

The confession of sin is not humiliating, as some suppose; it is the acknowledgment of our dignity rather. For it implies that we are not victims of circumstance but responsible persons. The Prodigal Son might have thought up a dozen excellent

excuses—his father was too ready to trust him, his friends had played him false, and so on. But so long as he thought in these terms he was fettered to the swine trough. Only as he accepted responsibility for his wasted life, only as he resolved to say to his father : ' I have sinned,' could he turn from his misery towards the lights of home. He who dares to take these words upon his lips stands thereby at the door of hope and as he knocks in penitence it will be opened to him in forgiveness.

2. We turn over a page and a scene of horror is before us. Two brothers quarrel and the quarrel ends with one lying dead at the other's feet. And now the second question : ' Where is thy brother ? ' is addressed to the murderer, whether cowering in fear at the prospect of exposure or trying to brazen it out. To be sure, Cain is as ready with an excuse as his father Adam was, and he asks in reply : ' Am I my brother's keeper ? ' Of course he is. As we are responsible for ourselves, so we are responsible for each other. History begins, we learned, with man's estrangement from God, and now we see the first consequence of this, that he lifts murderous hand against his brother man.

One had thought the old and foolish question : ' Who was Cain's wife ? ' was dead and buried by now. It is not, and one hears it raised sometimes still, apparently with all seriousness. It is not enough simply to show that these early narratives are not to be taken as plain record of fact, but rather as poetry, as how the Hebrew imagination pictured the beginnings of the race. Let us go on to point out the truth concealed within the tale, a searchingly terrible truth. It is that every generation since the first repeats the same hideous crime, the crime of fratricide.

After so many thousands of years, man still slays his fellow-man, and, that he may slay him the more efficiently, he robs Nature of her secrets. This question forces us out of our indifference, bidding us no longer live to ourselves but accept responsibility for our fellows. In a sense, our area of responsibility is as wide as the world : yet we can only discharge it adequately as we narrow it down to our duty towards those who are committed to us here and now.

3. So we come to the question that we address to God : ' Where is God ? ' But the Bible has anticipated us here, for it shows us men asking this question in grief of heart. The Psalmists ask it in the dreadful plight of their nation, with its ruined sanctuary and its cities laid waste. They cry out, asking God why He has abandoned His people so. A man asks it to-day in acute personal sorrow, when the support and stay of his life has been taken from him and he must stumble on alone. The victim of tyranny asks it, when he has been liberated from one concentration camp only to be sentenced to another, and he knows that this time there will be no escape short of death.

There is an answer to these doubts and perplexities, but it is so wonderful that many find it difficult to accept. The answer is in those ever-memorable words : ' In all their afflictions he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them.' We miss God if we look for Him in the dark power that sends calamity upon us ; we find Him as the one who shares calamity with us. The message of the Bible is confirmed in our experience : God is always with us, in joy and sorrow, life and death.

The God of the Bible comes down in Moses to deliver the slaves, in Hosea to agonize over a broken home and a faithless people, in Jeremiah to identify Himself with a nation in its defeat. The God of the Bible comes to us in a hill where three crosses are set up, so that we see how the innocent suffers *for* the guilty by suffering *with* them. He who hangs on the central cross is as dead, yet He is not dead. When men have taken Him down to dispose of Him, He returns to life and climbs the Cross to reign there as from a throne. When in our worst despair we ask where God is, He answers that He is with us in our despair, suffering to bring us through to the light.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY

The Triumph of Righteousness

BY THE REVEREND PRINCIPAL NORMAN H. SNAITH, D.D., WESLEY COLLEGE, LEEDS

' Behold, I was shapen in iniquity ; and in sin did my mother conceive me.'—Ps 51^5.

If this text is true, then it is as far away from the triumph of righteousness as any text could be. To speak of the attainment of righteousness to one who is conceived and born altogether in sin is a mockery. It is insisting on the accomplishment of that which by his very nature he cannot attain. Righteousness is the exact opposite of sin.

But is it true that man is a born sinner ? It is evident that the psalmist thought so. He is conscious of his own serious sin, so much so that he regards himself as being altogether vile. So convinced is he that he is wholly wrong, that he describes himself as wrong from the start, born that way, a sinner from his mother's womb. Was he right about himself ? Is he right about us ?

Everything depends upon what we mean by sin, and again on what we mean by righteousness. For there are two ways of thinking and talking about sin ; and there are two distinct ways of thinking about righteousness. We discuss first the meaning of the word ' sin.'

In the first place : Sin can refer to breaking an

ethical code, doing something that is ethically wrong. We speak of committing a sin. In this sense we are all of us sinners some of the time, but none of us a sinner all the time. We do things that are wrong. Sometimes this is through ignorance; we do not know any better. Sometimes it is because circumstances are too much for us; we cannot help it. We are worn down by continual temptation, the pressure of events overwhelms us, and so forth. Sometimes we sin because it is impossible in the circumstances to do what is wholly right; we have to choose between two courses of action, neither of which is wholly right, and both of which from the strictest ethical point of view are undesirable. One example of this is the whole problem of war and pacifism. Let us hope that we do not deliberately do things that are wrong. In all these cases, sin involves the breaking of a code of behaviour. It would presumably be right to say, either we are born good and become corrupted later by circumstances, by naughty boys and girls, or by parents who are not all they should be: or, we are born neutral, neither good nor bad, and it all depends on training and environment. But in either case, if only we are trained properly, with proper knowledge from without and with adequate stiffening from within, we shall steadily improve and the occasions on which we do what is wrong will become fewer and fewer.

On this basis, the psalmist is wrong, both for himself and for us. The triumph of righteousness is possible, for righteousness involves the observance of the ethical code. A non-religious man will minimize the value of religion in this respect. He may even say that the human race has progressed to the position where religion has ceased to be of service to mankind as a means by which individual and social righteousness can be established. The religious man will regard the example of Christ and of good men who have followed Him as the source of great inspiration and encouragement. Prayer and the exercises of religion generally may easily be means of considerable support to some.

The second way of thinking and talking about sin is to say that sin is the state of the soul that is self-centred, and being self-centred thus puts self before God. It is the state of the soul 'that seeketh its own' in contrast to the state of the man who is full of that Christian love which 'seeketh not its own,' the man who loves God with his whole self. Sin is thus the inherent selfishness of human nature. It is our heritage which we share with every living thing on earth. It is our counterpart to that struggle for survival to which all life on this planet is apparently doomed. We can see this struggle everywhere. In the plant-world there is a constant struggle for survival, not the less real because it is wholly unconscious. The plant which is most fitted for the particular environment in which it finds itself is the one that survives, and new-comers must change their characters if they would survive. Any man can see this struggle going on in his garden. When we grow cultivated cabbages with solid hearts, we do it at the expense of the plant's ability to fight against its rivals. We have to support it against other plants which have not been cultivated by human selection. We have to pull out the weeds, because the cultivated plant has largely lost its innate power to fight against the plants which have not been cultivated. The most obvious human form is war, but much of the rivalry between men and nations is of the same origin. Some of us can see this selfishness of human nature in all systems of private enterprise. Others can see it in all nationalized industries. Others of us, who are not immediately or personally involved in either system, can see that all systems are subject to the same weaknesses, and that our real problem is not political and economic, but is a personal problem. It is the problem of the individual, both of master and of man. In this sense, we are all sinners from our mother's womb, shapen in iniquity, conceived in sin. This is what the hymn writers mean when they use such phrases as 'enslaved by sin.' The most dangerous people in this world are the well-intentioned individuals who talk about the essential goodness of human nature. Whilst they talk pious platitudes, the raw selfishness of man runs riot. In general most of us would rather do right than wrong. The discussion as to whether we are naturally good or bad in the barely ethical sense has nothing to do with our present point. What matters is that we are essentially selfish, and it is this innate selfishness which gives all our actions the nature of sin.

A man can fulfil all the obligations of the moral code and can even pride himself on it, and at the same time he can be so selfish in all his ways and thoughts that it is patent to everybody. He makes his very righteousness a sin; that is, his ethical rectitude is itself a product of his selfishness, and he can easily give his selfishness a cloak of rectitude.

I referred earlier to another conception of righteousness. This is the righteousness which Jesus described as 'exceeding the righteousness of the scribes', for the righteousness of the scribes was of the strictly ethical type, and righteous as they undoubtedly were, they were nevertheless condemned by Jesus on that very ground. It is the 'righteousness' which is mentioned in Is 51^8 as the equivalent of salvation. It involves getting right with God, and the whole conception is based on the idea that religion is not primarily a code of morals or a pattern of behaviour, but a personal relationship with God. This is why sin, being selfishness,

sets up a barrier between God and man. It is why this barrier can be removed through the death and sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ; it is the love of God which breaks this barrier down. The righteousness which God manifests towards men goes out beyond ethical considerations and the establishment of justice. He goes out beyond these moral and ethical considerations to seek and to save that which is lost. He desireth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he shall turn from his wickedness and live. The triumph of righteousness does not mean the establishment of right conduct throughout the earth. It involves the turning of all men to Christ in true repentance and faith, so that the bonds of human selfishness are broken by the love of God which is shed abroad in our hearts. If we love God with all our heart and soul and strength, then there is no room for self-love in our hearts and we come to be at one with God. This is the triumph of righteousness.

The Impassibility of God

By the Reverend Edward Burnley, B.D., Corston Vicarage, Malmesbury

Divine impassibility is one of the attributes which have been associated with God in most orthodox Christian teaching. The idea has been challenged, however, and good reasons can be given for and against the view that suffering is contrary to God's nature.

Turning to the Bible for evidence, there is no need to deal with those anthropomorphic ideas of God which belong to the earlier stages of religious growth. From earliest Christian times these have been regarded as having only symbolical or spiritual value. Later Old Testament writings emphasized the transcendence of God; and this pointed to impassibility. In Isaiah and Ezekiel God is 'the holy one who inhabiteth eternity.' In Job, although the sufferer reaches the conviction that he will ultimately meet his vindicator, the general impression of the Book is that God is remote from the suffering of His servant. There is, however, another side to the picture of God's nature, even in the Old Testament. In the Covenant, God identifies Himself with His people to such an extent that He cannot but be affected by their circumstances. 'All the day long have I stretched out My hands to a disobedient and gainsaying people.' Hosea saw in his own domestic tragedy something of the love of God—a love which must have included an element of suffering. This relationship between God and His people is also expressed in the words, 'In all their affliction he was afflicted.'

The teaching of Jesus laid stress on the Fatherhood of God. If such a metaphor corresponds with reality it becomes difficult to dissociate from it the capacity to suffer. If God marks the sparrow's fall, and is even more concerned with man's well-being, a certain element of suffering seems to be implied. According to St. Paul, sin grieves the Holy Spirit. It seems reasonable to suppose that it grieves the Father also. If the Parable of the Prodigal Son gives a picture of God's attitude towards sinners, the argument would seem to be against Divine impassibility.

In spite of the considerations outlined above, the general view in the Early Church, and even among heretics such as Nestorius, was that God could not suffer. This may have been due largely to Greek influence in theology. This appears, for instance, in Clement of Alexandria, for whom God was the Monad. The true Christian reached Him by a knowledge which passed beyond time and space to a point, without even position. This metaphysical abstraction was remote from men, and also from Jesus Christ. The problem was discussed as part of the controversial issues connected with the Trinity and the nature of Christ. The Sabellian view, as stated by Praxeas, was that in Christ God became man in such a way that the Son was a mode of the Father's existence. This meant that the Father could be spoken of as crucified. Tertullian opposed this view, which was seen to destroy all real distinction of persons within the Godhead. Although it was true that He who was God suffered, it was seen to be misleading to state that God suffered. There was a real doctrinal point to be safeguarded. A somewhat similar difficulty arose in connexion with the two natures of Christ. Both Ignatius and Irenaeus wrote that for our sake the invisible became visible and the impassible became passible. There was a tendency, however, to separate the Divine from the human in Christ to a degree which imperilled the unity of His personality. Irenaeus said that the Logos remained quiescent in the human activities and limitations of Jesus, including His sufferings. The idea of suffering seemed to the orthodox to imply change in the Godhead. One of the affirmations (or was it a denial ?) laid down at Chalcedon in A.D. 451 was that Christ was '*atreptos*.' The essence of Godhead must be spiritual and unchangeable. It appeared dangerous to imply that God could be moved by anything outside His own will and nature. Divine impassibility was part of Divine consistency.

Arguments on this subject have continued to the present day. Those who have looked at the matter from a metaphysical and 'platonistic' point of

view have upheld the doctrine of impassibility; while others, who have been moved by personal and human considerations have reasoned for an element of suffering in the nature of God. Von Hügel was among the former. For him there must be some Being beyond the fluctuations of ordinary experience. Dr. Mackintosh held a similar view. He wrote: 'An unhappy God would mean a bankrupt universe.' On the other hand, Canon Brasnett, in his book, *The Suffering of the Impassible God*, tries to show that there is a place for suffering in the nature of God. W. R. Matthews sees that there are arguments on both sides; but he thinks that the balance is against rather than in favour of the orthodox view of Divine impassibility.

It is inevitable that the human mind cannot reach precise conclusions regarding the Divine nature. It is also difficult to hold together in the mind the different aspects of what has been revealed; still more to state them without appearing to utter contradictions, for truth is many-sided. In regard to the question of Divine impassibility, it might be treated from a physical, a metaphysical, or a moral standpoint. Indeed, all three would have to be considered. It is agreed that, from a physical point of view, 'God is without body, parts or passions.' The New Testament states that God is Spirit. Physical suffering, therefore, is out of the question when we are thinking of God. Metaphysically, the question becomes more difficult, for one is moving in the realm of the indefinable. Here it is not pain that is involved in impassibility; it is rather change. The Divine Essence would seem to be self-consistent and changeless. God is not moved by anything outside His own nature and will. In this sense most thinkers would agree with the orthodox view. It is when the moral nature of God is considered that differences of opinion arise. God is not an abstraction, not merely 'He who is,' but the Father of Jesus Christ. This truth was recognized, indeed, by Athanasius and many other Fathers of the Early Church who still emphasized the Divine impassibility. It is, however, this moral side of God's nature upon which the chief stress is laid in modern times; and it is difficult to exclude all association with suffering from a moral being. The New Testament teaches that God is love. All that we know about love indicates that there is in it the capacity for sacrifice and suffering. To the early Greek thinkers suffering was an evil thing. Thus the Cross to them was foolishness; and in the various systems of Gnosticism God was placed beyond the area where suffering occurred. The Cross, however, revealed suffering in its redemptive capacity. Gethsemane and Calvary show that both spiritual and physical suffering had a part in bringing the world into union with God; and St. Paul said that 'God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself.' That process involved suffering, which seems to have been shared by the Father Himself. 'God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son.' There are references in the New Testament, not only to God as love, but also to the wrath of God. This does not mean that the Divine essence is prone to change or fluctuation. God's wrath is the other side of His love. His very nature is opposed to evil. As Athanasius said, 'God is good, or rather the source of goodness.'

Unless this moral aspect of the Being of God is recognized the unity of the Godhead becomes broken up; for all agree that Christ suffered spiritually as well as physically. If it be argued that His sufferings related only to His manhood and not to His Godhead, this involves a breach in the unity of His Person. A love that suffers need not suggest defeat. It does not mean 'an unhappy God,' to use Dr. Mackintosh's phrase; nor need it be a permanent characteristic, 'He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied.' In Christ we see love that is victorious, and we may believe that sin and death will ultimately be done away. When that happens, the redemptive work of suffering love will be complete, and the unchangeable God will be acknowledged by all.

If the arguments given above are sound, it would seem that there is a truth to be safeguarded by the attribute of impassibility applied to God. His supreme and unchanging nature, and His transcendence are emphasized by this expression. It cannot, however, be used without qualification in view of the moral nature of God. Love cannot be dissociated entirely from suffering, at least in relation to a world in which sorrow and sin are part of actual experience.

Contributions and Comments

Amos vii. 14

'I was [am] no prophet, neither was [am] I a prophet's son.' (R.V.)

No one can tell how much ink commentators, expositors and exegetes, have spilled over this passage, and no useful purpose can be served by repeating the numerous explanations of the prophet's words; why should he say that he was not a prophet when he was seen and known by every one to be one? The answer, of course, is that he never said any such thing.

The Hebrew interrogative negative *hălō'* 'is it not, has it not?' and so on frequently has affirmative

force; it is therefore often translated so by the ancient Versions, *e.g.*, by the LXX ἰδού (*e.g.*, Gn 13^{9}, Dt 3^{1}, Jg 6^{13}, 2 Ch 9^{29}, Est 10^{2}), by the Vulg. *ecce* (*e.g.*, Gn 13^{9}, 1 K 11^{41}) or *en* (Jg 4^{14}), *scito* (Jg 6^{14}) or *forsitan* (Jg 5^{30}), and by the Pesh. and Targ. often *hâ* 'behold!' (*e.g.*, Dt 3^{11}). So 'is it not written?' and 'behold! it is written' are alternative modes of saying the same thing (G.-K. §150 e). The next stage is to omit the interrogative particle, especially after *ū-* 'and'; so Moses says 'lo, shall we sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians before their eyes, and will they not stone us?' (Ex 8^{26}), where the Heb. *wᵉlō'* is translated by the interrogative *hălâ* 'will not . . .?' by the Targ. but by the affirmative *hâ* 'lo!' by the Pesh., showing that the clause was taken to mean 'they will surely stone us.' This idiom occurs even when the preceding clause is not interrogative but affirmative; so Jonathan says 'for if I should know . . ., then would I not (=I would surely) tell thee' (1 S 20^{9}; cf. Jer 17^{8}, Ezk $16^{47.\ 56}$; and Ps 105^{28}, where the LXX has an affirmative clause). Lastly, the simple *lō'* 'not' is used with interrogative force, which easily becomes asseverative, strange as this may seem; so, after the defeat of the Philistines Jonathan says not 'for now hath there been no great slaughter among the Philistines' (R.V.), but 'for now had there not been (=there had indeed been) great slaughter among the Philistines?' (1 S 14^{30}; cf. Vulg.'s *nonne*). Many other examples, indeed, of the interrogative/affirmative use of *lō'* 'not' can be found (*e.g.*, 2 K 5^{26}, Ezk 11^{3}, Am 1^{3} *plus*, Jon 4^{11}, Job 2^{10} 8^{12} 11^{11} 14^{16} 21^{29} 23^{17} 33^{14}, La $3^{36.\ 38}$), sometimes represented by an asseverative particle in the ancient Versions (*e.g.*, Ru 2^{13}). The idiom may be regarded as well established, if not generally recognized, even though it has been much discussed (cf. Smith in *J.B.L.*, xxiv. 30, Haupt in *O.Lz.*, x. 305–6, Guidi in *Oriental Studies presented to E. G. Browne*, 175, Driver in *Bibl.* xxxv. 152, Nötscher in *Vet. Test*, iii. 374–375, and incidentally in commentaries on various passages).

What Amos says is free from difficulty, once this idiom is recognized. Amaziah has bidden him to cease prophesying or preaching at Bethel and to go back to Judah; thereupon Amos, supposing that his prophetic commission to prophesy wherever he is sent is called in question, with pardonable exaggeration indignantly exclaims 'I not a prophet nor the son of a prophet because I am a pricker and dresser of sycomore-trees! And the Lord has taken me from following the flock and has said to me: "Go and prophesy to my people Israel!"' In other words, Amos asks: 'do you suppose that I am not a true prophet because I'm a seasonal labourer (for pricking sycomores lasts only a few days in the season)? Why, the Lord has called me from my flocks and bidden me do it: I am a prophet fully commissioned to preach what the Lord bids me wherever He sends me.'

The idiom thus invoked to make what Amos says intelligible is not confined to the Hebrew language; it is found also in the cognate languages. Thus the Syr. *lâ* 'not' stands alone for the Heb. *hălō'* 'is not, has not?' when this has affirmative force (*e.g.*, Jg $9^{28.\ 38}$ 10^{11} 11^{7}, Pesh.), and the Arab. *lâ* 'not' is used with a strongly asseverative force by Muhammad, who says, for example, *lâ 'uqsimu yauma-'lqiyâmati* 'I not swear by the day of resurrection!' *i.e.*, 'shall I not' or 'I surely will swear by the day of resurrection' (*Qur'ân*, lxxv. 1; cf. lvi. 74, lxix. 38, lxx. 40, lxxv. 2, lxxxi. 15, lxxxiv. 16, xc. 1). The Arabic idiom, however, seems to be confined to oaths (Brockelmann, *G.V.G.S.S.*, ii. §105c).

The failure to recognize this idiom in the Old Testament has been a fruitful cause of mistaken interpretation. The failure is excusable, since its use depends on the tone of the speaker's voice which can differentiate between the negation of a fact and a question expecting an affirmative answer, a cry of indignation or a solemn asseveration; none of this can be shown in the written or printed text, which therefore is apt to be taken in its obvious and literal sense by unimaginative and unwary exegetes.

G. R. Driver

Oxford

Did Jesus Speak Greek?

There is abundant evidence in the Gospels that Jesus spoke Aramaic. Indeed some of His Aramaic sayings have been preserved (*e.g.*, Mk 5^{41} 7^{34} 14^{36} 15^{34}). But the question remains, Did He never speak anything but Aramaic? Did He also speak Greek?

He was brought up in Galilee, where many of the inhabitants would be Greek-speaking Gentiles.[1] If He held intercourse with these, conducted a carpenter's business of which many of these would be customers, and preached to multitudes of them, He must have spoken Greek. So must Peter and Andrew, James and John, if they sold their fish in Gentile markets, and so must Levi, being engaged in Government employ.

If Jesus in His teaching alluded to the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, even where it differed from the Hebrew, He must have known Greek.[2]

[1] See G. H. Boobyer, 'Galilee and Galileans in St. Mark's Gospel,' in *Bulletin of John Ryland's Library*, XXXV. ii. [March 1953], 334 f.

[2] Where there is reason to believe in an Aramaic source, as in the Matthaean 'Testimonia,' which seem to be based on the Targums, the O.T. quotations differ from the LXX. The O.T. quotation in Mk 4^{12} also follows the Targum and differs from the LXX.

Mt 5^{39-40} echoes Is 50^{6-8} in the LXX (*σιαγόνας . . . ῥαπίσματα . . . ἀπέστρεψα . . . κρινόμενος . . . ἀντιστήτω*). The Hebrew is quite different, and Jesus could not have obtained the same sequence of phrases from it.

It is commonly held that the details of our Lord's temptations (Mt 4^{1-11}, Lk 4^{1-13}) must have come from Jesus Himself. If so, He seems to have given the Old Testament quotations mainly in the LXX version, even where it differs from the Hebrew.[1]

If Jesus said 'one iota' (Mt 5^{18}), then He was speaking Greek. McNeile in his Commentary (*ad loc*) assumes without argument that 'For Greek readers Matthew represented the Hebrew *Yōd* by the corresponding Greek letter.'[2] But if Jesus was addressing a crowd in Galilee (and much of the 'Sermon' must have been so addressed), He would naturally speak in Greek and would say 'iota.'

Jesus was frequently called upon to speak to people who were unlikely to know Aramaic (*e.g.*, Mk $3^{7f.}$, Mt 4^{25}, Lk 6^{17}). The Syrophœnician woman was a Greek (Mk 7^{26}), and no doubt Jesus spoke to her in the language which she understood.

According to Jn 7^{35} the Jews asked concerning Jesus: 'Will he go . . . unto the Dispersion among the Greeks, and teach the Greeks?' Evidently it was known that Jesus could speak Greek. So, apparently, could Philip, to whom Greeks came and said, 'Sir, we would see Jesus' (Jn 12^{21}).

Peter on the day of Pentecost must have addressed the varied multitude from so many parts of the world in a common language which they could all understand (*Koiné* [Greek]). In the Dispersion 'the *language* used in the synagogue service was undoubtedly as a rule *Greek*.'[3] The fact that Peter in his speech quotes so extensively from the Septuagint, even where the LXX version differs from the Hebrew (Ac $2^{24.\ 25-26}$),[4] indicates that he spoke in Greek. James, the Lord's brother, also presumably spoke in Greek, since at Ac 15^{16-17} he is said to have quoted Am 9^{11-12} in the LXX version, and could not have made his point so effectively by quoting the different Hebrew version. (The LXX translators misread Edom as Adam.)

It seems that the circles in which Jesus grew up and moved understood Greek as well as Aramaic. He and His disciples may often have conversed in Greek. If in places we are reading the language He spoke, it is possible that we are reading His actual words.

Of course He often spoke Aramaic as well. In addition to His actual Aramaic words which have come down to us, there appear to be many Aramaisms in His sayings, especially in material commonly assigned to Q.[5] But it is a mistake to assume that there must be Aramaic behind *all* His words. Some Aramaists in their enthusiasm for the theory of Aramaic in His sayings overstate their case and produce doubtful arguments. This is sometimes so even in the work of a cautious scholar like Dr. M. Black.

For instance, he argues that the frequent occurrence of the 'proleptic construction,' especially in sayings addressed by or to Jesus, points to an original Aramaic.[6] By a 'proleptic construction' is meant one in which the subject of a dependent clause is transferred by anticipation to the principal clause, usually with a change of case: for example, Mk 1^{24} (*οἶδα σε τίς εἶ*), Mt 6^{28} 25^{24}, Lk 12^{27} 24^{7}, Jn 7^{27} 9^{29}. Dr. Black argues that this construction, while not specially Semitic, is nevertheless much more common in Aramaic than in Greek, and that its frequent occurrence in dialogue points to an Aramaic source.

But this construction occurs very frequently in Greek literature, classical, Hellenistic, and neo-Hellenic.[7] It is specially common in dialogue (the dramatists and Plato).[8] Its occurrence in the Gospels does not need to be explained as an Aramaism. Moreover in the New Testament it is not confined to dialogue. It is found in narrative (Mk 7^{2} 11^{32} 12^{34} 15^{24}), and in the Epistles (*e.g.*, 1 Co 16^{15}, 2 Co 12^{17}, Ro 13^{11}, 1 Jn 4^{1}, 2 Jn[8]) where no Aramaic original is to be suspected. The usage is Greek, and though it is Semitic as well, its occurrence in the New Testament can be explained without recourse to the Aramaic theory.

The importance of establishing that Jesus and His disciples sometimes spoke Greek cannot be overestimated. It means that in some cases we may have direct access to the original utterances of our Lord and not only to a translation of them.

A. W. Argyle

Oxford

---

[1] See my Note in The Expository Times, lxiv. [September 1953], 382.

[2] So also T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 154.

[3] E. Schürer, 'Diaspora' in *H.D.B.*, extra vol., 107a.

[4] Ac 2^{24} has, with LXX of Ps 18^{4} 116^{3}, 'pangs' where the Hebrew means 'cords.' Ac 2^{25-26} has, with LXX of Ps 16^{8-9}, 'I beheld' where the Hebrew has 'I have set,' and 'my tongue' where the Hebrew has 'my glory.' For other differences, see F. F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts* [1954], 71.

[5] See F. Bussby, 'Is Q an Aramaic Document?' in The Expository Times, lxv. [June 1954], 272 f.

[6] *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*[2] [1954], 36 f.

[7] A. N. Jannaris, *An Historical Greek Grammar* [1897], 452.

[8] See the examples in R. Kühner, *Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, part ii. revised by B. Gerth [1898–1904], vol. ii. 577 f. Cf. the note by L. L. Forman in his edition of Aristophanes, *Clouds* [Chicago, 1915], 298.

Recent Foreign Theology

Criticism of the Fourth Gospel. From Denmark comes a study of the Fourth Gospel which will claim the attention of New Testament scholars. This is from the pen of Bent Noack, and it appears in the publications of the young university of Aarhus.[1] The author begins by outlining Bultmann's analysis of the Gospel into sources, of which the two principal ones are a 'sign' source and a 'revelation' source. After a critical examination of the grounds on which this view is based, Noack is unconvinced of its soundness, though he recognizes varieties of material in the Gospel. He offers a careful study of Johannine Logia, Old Testament citations in the Fourth Gospel in comparison with those of the Synoptics, Synoptic Logia, and accounts of miracles and other narratives, and reaches the conclusion that we have in the Fourth Gospel the work of an author who prepared his work independently of the Synoptic Gospels, but on the basis of materials received through oral tradition. There will be found here, therefore, an example of the Scandinavian approach which we have found applied to the Old Testament, but brought into relation to the New. Characteristic of this approach is the emphasis on oral tradition and the elimination of written sources. As a reaction against over-refined literary analysis it is to be welcomed; but the reaction can easily be carried too far in its elimination of written sources.

The Ancient Near East. Professor Sabatino Moscati has written an excellent book for the Biblioteca Enciclopedica Sansoniana, entitled *The Orient in New Light*,[2] in which he reviews recent discovery and research on the Ancient Near East. He takes within his purview excavations at Mari and Ras Shamra, recently found ancient law codes, the Karatepe texts, recent scientific discoveries of value to the Oriental scholar, such as radiocarbon dating, the new evidence which has come to light in recent years for the dating of Hammurabi, and the important changes in our view of ancient chronology which have ensued, and a host of other things. Special attention is paid to Ras Shamra, and there is a useful summary of the import of the mythological texts in alphabetic cuneiform. A chapter is devoted to the light shed on Ancient Israel by inscriptions now known, including the Lachish Letters. As there are references to works published in 1954, it is surprising to find no mention of the Brooklyn Aramaic Papyri from Elephantine, which were published in 1953. There is a chapter devoted to recent publications on South Arabia, and another on recent studies on the Islamic sources of Dante's *Divina Commedia*. Much else is found in this compact and valuable little book, which is well designed to mediate to a wide public the results of recent work, and it may be warmly commended.

One Volume Bible Commentary in Dutch. A one volume commentary designed for the general reader is appearing in parts in Holland.[3] Thirteen parts, each of sixty-four pages, have so far been issued, and these cover the whole of the Old Testament, and some of the general New Testament articles. The general editor was the late Dr. J. A. vor der Hake, and the contributors include scholars of the eminence of Böhl, Edelkoort, Gemser, Obbink, van Unnik, Vriezen and de Zwaan, together with a number of others. It is, therefore, sound in its scholarship and modern in its outlook. There are some excellent general articles at the beginning, and the commentary is brief and without the text. It must suffice to note a few samples of its positions. Edelkoort interprets all the four Servant Songs in the future individual sense, and thinks the word 'Israel' in Is 49[3] is an addition to the text. Obbink dates Daniel in the second century B.C., and adheres to the traditional dating of Ezra before Nehemiah, and the placing of Ezekiel's ministry wholly in Babylonia. Neither in the matter of the dating of Ezra nor in the matter of Ezekiel is the reader introduced to the variant views that have been offered in modern times. Vriezen thinks that Hos 1 and 3 refer to marriages of the prophet with different wives. One of the most significant things of the time is the steady stream of commentaries in many languages, written by both Roman Catholic and Protestant writers, designed for the general public and mediating the fruits of scholarship.

The God Carmel. Professor O. Eissfeldt has issued a small study in the Proceedings of the Berlin Academy, arguing that the god of Carmel was called Carmel.[4] Avi-Yonah discovered the inscription *Διὶ Ἡλιοπολείτῃ Καρμήλῳ* on a marble

[1] *Zur johanneischen Tradition: Beiträge zur Kritik an der literarkritischen Analyse des vierten Evangeliums* [1954]. Rosenkilde og Bagger, Copenhagen; Kr. 20.

[2] *Oriente in Nuova Luce* [1951]. Sansoni, Florence; Lire 600.

[3] *Commentaar op de Heilige Schrift.* Fasc. 1–13 [1952–3]. H. J. Paris, Amsterdam; Fl. 3.00 per part.

[4] *Der Gott Karmel* [1953]. Akademie Verlag, Berlin; DM 4.

foot, and from this Eissfeldt argues that *Ζεὺς Ἡλιοπολείτης* or Jupiter Heliopolitanus is here identified with the god Carmel. In other periods other identifications—with Melkart or Baal-shamem—may have been made, but these were interpretations or reinterpretations of Carmel. In an appendix Eissfeldt discusses K. Galling's article on the same subject in the *Alt Festschrift*,[1] which only came into his hands after his own work was complete.

Dutch Bible Atlas. A fine Biblical Atlas, abundantly illustrated with photographs, and accompanied by a Dutch text briefly surveying Biblical history, has been produced by Father L. H. Grollenberg, with the assistance of A. van Deursen.[2] There are thirty-seven good maps and more than four hundred fine photographs, illustrating sites, material finds, and occasionally texts, all of which are of great value even to the reader who cannot understand the Dutch text of the history. The author, who was formerly at the École Biblique in Jerusalem, is well acquainted with modern archaeological work, and his book is both scholarly and up-to-date. Of particular value are some of the photographs which enable the reader to get a clearer idea of the terrain than many pages of descriptive writing would give him. There is an excellent index, and the Dutch student of the Bible is to be envied this first class tool.

The Temple. In the French series of *Cahiers d'Archéologie Biblique* Professor André Parrot has issued a new volume, dealing with the Temple of Jerusalem.[3] The first section deals with the Temple of Solomon, the second with Ezekiel's Temple, after which the Second Temple and Herod's Temple are discussed. There are numerous illustrations and diagrams, together with a picture of a full scale reconstruction of the Temple. Parrot rightly warns against thinking of Solomon's Temple as merely a royal shrine, and points out that it was designed to be the religious centre of the people as well as the royal sanctuary. His work is based throughout on a full acquaintance with scholarly writing on the subject, but this little book is designed for wide circulation, and well deserves it.

H. H. ROWLEY

Manchester University

[1] 'Der Gott Karmel und die Ächtung der fremden Götter,' in *Geschichte und Altes Testament* [1953] (cf. THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lxvi. [December, 1954], 94 f.).

[2] *Atlas van de Bijbel* [1954]. Elsevier, Amsterdam and Brussels; Fl. 29. 50. A French edition has been more recently issued, with a preface by Father de Vaux, by Elsevier, Brussels and Paris; price French Fr. 3,500.

[3] *Le Temple de Jérusalem* [1954]. Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchatel and Paris; Swiss Fr. 4.50.

Entre Nous

C. S. Lewis

Professor C. S. Lewis's autobiography, *Surprised by Joy: The Shape of My Early Life* (Bles; 15s. net), is not mainly a chronicle of events; it is a spiritual odyssey, the story of a man's conversion. C. S. Lewis uses the word *joy* in a technical way. He cites four things in his early life which brought him this joy. One was the sight of a toy garden made in the lid of a biscuit tin. One was the sight of a flowering currant on a spring day. It brought him 'a sense of enormous bliss,' and a great desire. The third was the experience of reading Beatrix Potter's 'Squirrel Nutkin.' There came to him through that book 'the idea of autumn.' As it were, he fell in love with a season. Once again there came this haunting desire and he would go back to the book, not to satisfy the desire, but to awaken it again. The fourth experience came through Longfellow's 'Saga of King Olaf.' 'I desired with almost sickening intensity something never to be described (except that it is cold, spacious, severe, pale, and remote), and then, as in the other examples, found myself at the very same moment already falling out of that desire and wishing I were back in it.' The quality which ran through all four experiences was the 'unsatisfied desire which in itself is more desirable than any other satisfaction. I call it joy.' Joy is not pleasure for 'joy is never in our power and pleasure often is.'

But there came things to kill this spiritual view of life. Professor Lewis calls his first school a 'concentration camp,' and grimly describes it. In his preparatory school he was happy. But his public school, thinly disguised under the name of 'Wyvern,' as he saw it then, was a welter of homosexuality.

It was at his preparatory school, called Chartres, that his atheism and agnosticism began. Partly it was due to a school matron, who was kind and gracious, but who dabbled in the occultism of Theosophy, Rosicrucianism and Spiritualism. 'I was soon (in the famous words) altering "I believe" to "one does feel."' Further, there was in him a kind of ingrained pessimism. His father had given him the idea that the workhouse was never far away, although that was far from the truth, but from his father's outbursts he had got the idea that the formula for life was: 'Term, holidays, term,

holidays, till we leave school, and then, work, work, work, till we die.' Still further, prayer became an intolerable torture. A voice was always saying: 'Yes, but are you sure you were really thinking about what you said?' Then it would say: 'Were you, for example, thinking about it as well as you did last night?' Then the voice would go on: 'Very well, hadn't you, then, better try it again?' The whole process became insufferable. In addition Professor Lewis discerns in himself two characteristics—he was more interested to avoid pain than to find happiness and, more than anything else in this world, he resented interference. There is little wonder that in the end he bade farewell to religion and turned to downright atheism for sheer liberation.

The story of his journey back to belief is fascinating. As he tells us of the various things which slowly drew him back to discover that materialism is not enough, he gives us an extraordinary list—George MacDonald's 'Phantastes,' Bergson, Yeats, Euripides' 'Hippolytus,' Chesterton's 'Everlasting Man,' the society of men whose mental calibre he never doubted and who yet accepted the Christian way. Professor Lewis came back to Christian faith in two stages. First, he returned to theism, the belief that there is a God, a God who is active in the world and who is approachable. When he got to that stage he returned to the attendance of the Church, for in honour he felt that one must 'fly one's flag.'

And then the full return was made. 'I was driven to Whipsnade one sunny morning. When we set out I did not believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and when we reached the zoo I did. Nor in great emotion. "Emotional" is perhaps the last word we can apply to some of the most important events. It was more like when a man, after long sleep, still lying motionless in bed, becomes aware that he is now awake.' That is one of the great definitions of conversion which will certainly take its place for ever in devotional literature.

This is a strange book. One cannot help feeling that sometimes it says too much and sometimes it says too little. It is a fascinating book which will not allow itself to be laid down. But why in the end is there still a feeling of dissatisfaction in at least one reader's mind? WILLIAM BARCLAY

Her Question

'Most of the members of the family had been compelled to leave home for distant places, to find spheres in which they could use their talents, and perhaps because they were too busy they sent little news home of how they were faring. At last the son who had remained at home found it possible to leave the farm for a holiday, which he spent in visiting relatives who had gone away.

'When he returned home a family party was held, so that all interested might hear his news, and he held them entranced as he told of Cousin James here, and Uncle Fred somewhere else, and of all the others he had seen. "And did you go and see John?" asked one of the company. "Of course," he replied, "I saw a lot of John. John is getting on in the world." There was a moment's quiet, and then the grey-headed mother by the fireside asked, "Which world?"' This quotation is from Ezra's 'Table-Talk' in *The Methodist Recorder* for 20th October. This 'Table-Talk' is always well done.

Our Human Predicament

'No reader of the first three chapters of Romans can doubt what Paul considers the root-cause of our human malaise and dispeace. It is "the ungodliness and unrighteousness of men" which brings them under the condemnation of the holy God who made them. Paul believes in original sin. He does not dismiss sin as ignorance or mere imperfection. He believes that our human nature is badly warped from its true design—that sin is not an incident but a state, a state of the race in which things have gone radically awry. We are all involved in it without exception—like runners in the strawberry-bed, we are all connected up through a common life-root, and through that root-system flows evil. It is true that Paul traces this moral evil back to Adam; but it is not necessary for us to accept all he says about Adam in order to maintain that his diagnosis of our human condition is substantially accurate.'[1]

Errata

Two corrections have to be made. In a recent number we said that the Rev. C. B. Cranfield now had a charge. He is still, however, Lecturer in Theology in the University of Durham.

The well-known lines—

God who created me
Nimble and light of limb,
In three elements free,
To run, to ride, to swim.

were attributed in the October number (p. 22) to G. K. Chesterton. The author is Henry Charles Beeching (1859–1919).

[1] A. M. Hunter, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 19f. (review will appear in January).

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.